



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2020

No. 112

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, June 18, 2020, at 10 a.m.

## Senate

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2020

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God of Heaven and Earth, today, teach our lawmakers to do things Your way, embracing Your precepts and walking in Your paths.

Lord, make them powerful instruments for goodness in our Nation and world. Remind them that the narrow and difficult road leads to life and few find it. You honor those who honor You.

As our Senators receive guidance from You and follow Your leading, replace anxiety with calm and confusion with clarity. Give them attentive hearts and open minds as they seek to find, in the diversity of ideas, what is best for our Nation and world.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute as in morning business, and if

the leader doesn't come, I may ask for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### JUSTICE ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, yesterday, I gave the details of historic police reform that passed unanimously in both houses of the Republican-controlled legislature. Surely, if Democrats in Iowa can work with Republicans to find unanimity, we shouldn't have any problems here in the U.S. Congress passing something unanimously as well. Let's not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

This morning, Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL, Senator TIM SCOTT, and other Members of the Republican task force unveiled a piece of legislation that goes by the title of Just and Unifying Solutions to Invigorate Communities Everywhere, or the acronym JUSTICE, for short.

I applaud their leadership on this issue. Democrats should stop partisan attacks and instead spend their time with us working together to find solutions. It is pretty simple for me. If the Iowa legislature can do it in a bipartisan and unanimous way, we can do it here as well.

### TROOP WITHDRAWAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, while there are reports of plans to remove troops stationed in Germany, I am reluctant to comment on a proposal that I have not seen.

What I can say, however, is that Congress will have a say. What I can also say is that the U.S. commitment to NATO and our European allies is rock solid. That said, it is not in the American character to project power for power's sake.

Since World War II, we have reluctantly accepted the lesson that our geography and good will alone cannot protect us in the United States from being dragged into other things around the globe, particularly conflicts.

The U.S. military presence in Europe since World War II has preserved the freedom of half of Europe and contributed to the eventual freedom of the other half of Europe. Yet, despite enjoying economic and security benefits, polls show our presence is unpopular with a large segment of the German population. Combine the American public's reluctance to station troops abroad with the sense that they are not wanted or appreciated by their hosts, you can expect some second thoughts.

This isn't the whole story. I know many German political leaders who treasure the friendship between our two countries, and their voices are needed now more than ever before. Moreover, our bases in Germany are not there just for the Germans. They provide critical support to troops in harm's way in the Middle East and are vital for NATO deterrence.

The people of Poland and the Baltic countries are among the most pro-American that you can find anywhere in the world, and the governments representing them put their money where their mouth is when it comes to NATO. Our mere presence in Europe reduces

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3025

the likelihood of Russian aggression against these friends and a repeat of their past oppression.

America will not abandon our allies. Our credibility and national honor demand it.

I yield the floor.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

#### REMEMBERING ELEANOR CAROL LEAVELL BARR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on behalf of the entire Kentucky delegation, all Kentuckians and the entire U.S. Congress, I must begin this morning by expressing our deepest condolences to our colleague Representative ANDY BARR and his family.

His lovely wife Carol passed away suddenly and unexpectedly yesterday. She was only 39 years old. She leaves behind her husband, their two beautiful young daughters, Eleanor and Mary Clay, and an entire community that knew her, admired her, and valued her many contributions.

To meet Carol Barr was instantly to like her. Her warm personality filled the room and uplifted everybody. Her faith, her love of family, and her dedication to her community were totally evident. Through her own career and her work with ANDY, she poured her time and talents into giving back to her neighbors in the Sixth District.

We are so very, very sorry for our colleague's loss. All of our prayers go out to ANDY, to their girls, and to the entire Barr and Leavell families at this tremendously difficult hour.

#### JUSTICE ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on an entirely different matter, Breonna Taylor and George Floyd. Over the last several months, our country has been shaken by the killings of more Black Americans at the hands of law enforcement. The people of this country have called for change.

The United States of America is not a fundamentally racist country. We are the greatest Nation in world history built on the promise of liberty and justice for all, but our founding promise was stained by the sins of slavery and racial prejudice. Generations of Americans have spent more than a century working to remediate that stain. We fought a Civil War. Black Americans led a movement that won historic Supreme Court wins and landmark Federal legislation. We have squeezed racist lies out of mainstream society and relegated them to a pathetic fringe.

But the events of the last few weeks have reminded this country that the stain is not totally gone. We have a lot more work to do. While the far left has tried to exploit America's pain and

anger to push insane policies like defunding or disbanding all police or nonsense claims like the assertion that enforcing laws is inherently racist, the rest of the country has been busy uniting around some commonsense truths.

When Black Americans tell us they do not feel safe in their own communities, we need to listen. When American citizens lack faith in our justice system from start to finish, we need to respond. When the equal protection of the laws feel to some Americans like a contingency of demographics and not a universal fact of life, we need to act. That is what this Senate Republican majority is doing today. We are acting.

Sadly, the junior Senator from South Carolina is no stranger to this subject himself. Senator SCOTT has led the construction of a strong proposal that will increase transparency, grow accountability, and advance the cause of police reform without lashing out at the lion's share of brave law enforcement officers who serve bravely and well.

Later today, he will introduce this new legislation, and it will be the very next bill we consider here on the Senate floor. We will be turning to this bill next week. Senator SCOTT's JUSTICE Act provides solutions that are as sober, as serious, and as significant as this watershed moment demands.

Faced with the fact that policing is primarily a local and State, rather than a Federal, concern, our colleague has nevertheless found a variety of levers that Congress can pull to advance and incentivize and insist on the changes that we need to see. We need to encourage police departments across America to implement practical reforms like ending choke holds, training their officers to deescalate tense situations, and having prior disciplinary records play a greater role in hiring. His bill does that.

We need to increase accountability so that bad officers are easy to spot and good officers' good names stay clear. This bill does that. It will get more body cameras on the streets, help ensure they are used properly, and disseminate new best practices for discipline, suspension, or dismissal when necessary. We also need more transparency so communities have greater visibility into local law enforcement. This bill does that too. We will require full reporting to the FBI when a local officer has used force or discharged his or her weapon.

In a subject that has tragically become a major focus for my hometown of Louisville, KY, we address no-knock warrants as well. We will require new transparency and new reporting from State and local authorities so surrounding communities and the Federal Government can all better understand how, when, and why this practice is used.

These are just some of the major parts of our colleague's legislation. The JUSTICE Act will also finally make lynching a Federal crime. It will close the consent loophole by forbidding law

enforcement from taking advantage of people in their custody and more.

This legislation is a substantial effort to help our Nation make major headway on substantial challenges. I am grateful to Senator SCOTT for his leadership. I appreciate the contributions of Chairman LINDSEY GRAHAM, Senators CAPITO, CORNYN, LANKFORD, and SASSE.

The Democratic-led House of Representatives is, of course, out of town. They have had time to issue partisan attacks from long distance but have yet to take up any police reform legislation in the weeks since the deaths of Ms. Taylor and Mr. Floyd.

The action is in the Senate. The leadership is in the Senate. Now, over the past several days, some of our Senate Democratic colleagues have undertaken to attack this new legislation before they have even read it and before it was even released—while it was still being compiled, as a matter of fact. Let me make this perfectly clear. Senate Republicans are interested in making a law. We want to enact needed reforms. We want to make policing in America better.

We have just demonstrated on the CARES Act and, once again, on the Great American Outdoors Act, that we can act together and achieve bipartisan support. This is another one of those issues that needs to be addressed—needs to be addressed now and can only be addressed in the Senate if both sides are willing to work together.

Needless to say, if we are going to make law on this issue in the Senate, it will have to be a bipartisan effort. I hope and expect that there will be opportunities for amendments from both sides. I hope we can step up, stand together, and work in good faith to turn this impressive starting point into law for our country. We will have the chance next week, so let's don't waste it.

#### GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now, on another matter. Every year in Kentucky, nearly 350,000 people take to the great outdoors to go hunting—more than a third of them on public lands. Over half a million head to the Commonwealth's lakes and rivers to fish, and 1.3 million enjoy the open space and the majesty of our wildlife looking for a glimpse of the Bluegrass' native species. And 120,000 Kentuckians earn their living keeping these vibrant traditions of outdoor recreation up and running for everyone else. Public lands are an important part of life across our State. From the Cumberland Gap to the Land Between the Lakes, our parks, our refuges, and historic sites form the backbone of local economies and welcome millions of visitors from across the country and around the world.

If you ask any of my colleagues, you would hear similar stories about the landmarks, wilderness, and history

that made their own States unique. America's hundreds of millions of acres of public lands are the result of hundreds of years of exploration and conservation. Today, the Senate will act to ensure this inheritance will stand the test of time for generations of Americans yet to come.

The Great American Outdoors Act will bring much needed resources to the long-deferred maintenance and upkeep in parks and other public lands all across our country. It will secure permanent support for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and its mission of expanding access to national treasures.

This major legislation is only before us because of the persistent effort on the part of several of our colleagues. So one last time, I thank Senator GARDNER and Senator DAINES for their outstanding leadership, and Senators PORTMAN, MANCHIN, ALEXANDER, and WARNER, among other colleagues on both sides, for all their work to bring this bipartisan project to completion.

I hope, following our action, the House will take it up and pass it quickly. The President has already said he is eager to sign it. We should not let this historic opportunity pass us by. I look forward to passing this monumental legislation later today.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

##### TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019— Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1957, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### JUSTICE ACT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, in the wake of recent tragic deaths of several

African Americans at the hands of the police, our country has reached a turning point.

Americans of every race, background, and political persuasion are calling for change. Too many Americans feel unsafe right now. Too many Americans live in fear that what happened to George Floyd could happen to their own fathers, sons, and brothers. Too many Americans see in law enforcement officers individuals to be feared rather than trusted.

Americans are ready for all of that to end. They want reform and increased accountability. They want to make sure that we are holding our law enforcement officers to the highest standards. And they want their fellow Americans to feel confident that what happened to George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and too many others will not happen to their loved ones.

Members of Congress have been listening. I have been listening. Today, I am proud to rise in support of Senator SCOTT's policing reform bill, which I am cosponsoring.

Senator SCOTT's Just and Unifying Solutions to Invigorate Communities Everywhere Act, or the JUSTICE Act, is the product of a lot of serious work—years of it, in fact. The JUSTICE Act is an extensive bill that addresses various aspects of policing reform. One important section of the bill is the George Floyd and Walter Scott Notification Act, which would correct deficiencies in law enforcement reporting of use-of-force incidents.

Right now, the FBI National Use-of-Force Data Collection receives data on only about 40 percent of law enforcement officers. That needs to change. The only way we can understand the scope of the problems we are facing is to have full and accurate data. A complete data picture will allow us to pinpoint problems, identify troubled police departments, and develop best practices for use of force and deescalation training.

There are many, many police departments across our Nation that are doing an exemplary job of policing, that have excellent relationships with the community, and that are already implementing a lot of best practices. But there are also more troubled police departments.

Police departments that fail to train their officers properly overlook officer misbehavior. We need to identify those police departments and demand their reform. Collecting full and accurate data on use-of-force incidents will help us do that.

One policing measure that has been found to reduce both officers' use of force and complaints against police officers is body cameras. Body-worn cameras record every officer interaction with the community, which encourages appropriate behavior and helps to create an accurate record of events. These cameras keep both citizens and police officers safer. But implementing the use of these cameras can be costly, as

can storing the copious data that accumulates. So the JUSTICE Act will create a new grant program to help local police departments purchase body-worn cameras and associated data storage. Funding eligibility will be conditional on the department's implementation of best practices for these cameras, and any department that fails to properly use the cameras that it has purchased using the grant program will face a reduction in Federal funding.

Another important section of the JUSTICE Act focuses on police deescalation and duty-to-intervene training. Sometimes police end up using force in situations where it could have been avoided simply because they lack the necessary training to deescalate a situation without the use of force. It may be understandable that well-meaning but overwhelmed police officers in dangerous circumstances have sometimes resorted to the use of force too quickly, but that is not a situation we can accept.

Every police officer in this country should be given the kind of training that will ensure that use of force is restricted only to those situations where it is absolutely needed.

I expect to see a lot of support for this bill from my Republican colleagues here in the Senate. I wouldn't be surprised if this bill receives a lot of support from law enforcement, as well, because most of our Nation's law enforcement officers want to implement policing best practices. They want to develop strong relationships with the communities they protect, and they want to avoid use-of-force incidents that place both officers and suspects in jeopardy.

I met with local law enforcement leaders in my home State of South Dakota last Friday. What I heard from them was a real desire to do everything they can to serve every member of their communities. They have already been participating in forums to listen to community concerns in the wake of George Floyd's death, and they are supportive of JUSTICE Act measures to help departments expand their minority hiring, to improve deescalation training, and to develop and promulgate best practices. I wouldn't be surprised if they and a lot of other law enforcement agencies end up backing this bill.

I really hope Democrats will come to the table as well. Senator SCOTT has produced a bill that should have the support of every Member of the Senate, and I hope that it will.

We have made a lot of progress as a nation when it comes to overcoming the sins of our past, but it would be a mistake to think that because we have made progress, our work is over. There is still much to be done and many wounds to heal.

We must make those tasks a priority. We must continue to work toward a more perfect Union, toward the full realization of our founding promise that all men are created equal, and toward

an America where there is truly liberty and justice for all.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

POLICE REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, this morning we have a tale of two Chambers. The House of Representatives is starting the consideration of the Justice in Policing Act, led by Senators BOOKER and HARRIS in the Senate and developed in conjunction with the Congressional Black Caucus and House Democrats. The bill represents comprehensive, strong, and enduring reform to police departments—the most forceful set of changes in decades.

This morning in the Senate, Republicans have put forward a separate proposal, led by the Senator from South Carolina. We have had the bill for only a few hours and are reviewing it. But what is clear is that the Senate Republican proposal on policing does not rise to the moment.

The Democratic bill has a ban on no-knock warrants in Federal drug cases, while the Republican bill only requires data on no-knock warrants. The Democratic bill has a publicly available nationwide database on misconduct so that abusive police officers who are fired can't simply go to another department somewhere else in the country and get hired. The Republican bill would keep such information almost entirely shielded from public view.

The Democratic bill bans choke holds and other tactics that have killed Black Americans. The Republican bill purports to ban choke holds but only those that restrict air flow and not blood flow and provides exceptions when deadly force is needed. Who determines when deadly force is needed? Usually the police themselves, and the courts defer to their judgment.

The Republican bill is silent on racial profiling and militarization of local police departments. Perhaps the greatest flaw in the Republican proposal is that it is missing real, meaningful accountability for individual officers' misconduct.

There are no reforms to qualified immunity or pattern-and-practice investigations. This is critically important. Without accountability measures, we are merely exhorting police departments to do better, crossing our fingers and hoping for the best. Real change comes with accountability. As drafted, the Republican bill doesn't provide it.

So we have a tale of two Chambers, a glaring contrast between a strong, comprehensive Democratic bill in the

House and a much narrower and much less effective Republican bill in the Senate.

I am glad that Leader MCCONNELL has listened to our demands to bring a police reform bill to the floor before July 4. I have been asking him to do this for 3 weeks, and he has finally acceded. I am glad Republicans have finally joined the debate and put a proposal forward after much pressure from the public, but any final product must be strong and must make real and lasting changes.

I would note that before we even get to a police reform proposal, the Republican leader wants to approve a circuit court judge next week—the same week we are doing police reform—Cory Wilson, who has a record of hostility toward voting rights, a nominee who advocated baseless claims of voter fraud and called the concern over voter suppression and discrimination “poppycock.”

This is sort of the two-faced approach that we are seeing. On the one hand, they say “Let's do something on police reform”; on the other hand, they put judges who come in exactly the opposite place and take away voting rights and healthcare rights and other things that affect African Americans, particularly poor African Americans.

The Senate is a place where you can succeed only if you convince a substantial majority of the Chamber that you have good legislation. We expect our Republican colleagues to work with us to make significant improvement to any legislation in order for it to pass. We take this very seriously. As we continue to review the Republican legislation, I will be talking to my caucus about the best way to strengthen it. This bill will need dramatic improvement.

Let me be clear. This is not letting the perfect be the enemy of the good. This is about making the ineffective the enemy of the effective.

Let me repeat that. This is not about letting the perfect be the enemy of the good. This is about replacing what is ineffective with what is effective, and we must have effective change.

The question is whether legislation will bring the change we so desperately need or fail to make those necessary changes, fail to stop more Black Americans from dying at the hands of police. The question is, Will it work? The Republican bill has a long way to go to meet this moment.

There has been a lot of talk from the Republican leader about the “real challenge” of getting onto a bill. Frankly, the “real challenge” is whether Senate Republicans will be able to step up to the plate and rise to the moment and vote for a bill that actually solves the problem. We Democrats are going to try to get them there.

It is important that we get this right. The vast majority of Americans from both political parties support far-reaching reforms. More than 75 percent want to allow victims of police mis-

conduct to more easily sue police departments for damages. More than 80 percent want to ban choke holds and racial profiling. More than 90 percent support independent investigations of police departments that show patterns of misconduct. And more than 90 percent want a Federal requirement that police wear body cameras. There is no reason to scribble our changes in the margins or nibble around the edges of this large, difficult, and persistent problem. The moment calls for bold action, and the American people are behind it.

Yesterday, we all got a good look at what window dressing looks like and what we must all strive to avoid. The President celebrated an Executive order that supposedly was about police reform, but, in reality, it was a bunch of vague incentives to suggest that police departments change on their own. The “ban on choke holds” wasn't a ban at all. Even the databases proposed by the Executive order are voluntary, not mandatory.

Befitting the seriousness of the topic, the President spent the majority of his press conference demonizing peaceful protesters, airing unjustified grievances against past administrations, and suggesting that the same scientific expertise that led to the AIDS vaccine will lead to a COVID vaccine. Of course, there is no AIDS vaccine.

This was the President's conference on police reform—unbelievable what he said at this serious moment.

We have to do a much better job here in Congress. The President isn't going to lead on these issues. He is not going to engage with the legislation or propose effective reforms. He is too busy threatening to sue news organizations over unflattering polls.

We, in the Congress, have to take up the mantle, and I am glad we will be turning to this subject next week. We must all set our sights on achieving real, strong, effective reforms to police departments in America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there are moments in history when you think: This is going to make a difference. One of them was in a first-grade classroom in Connecticut. A person walked into that classroom several years ago and opened fire on first grade students—6 years of age, 7 years of age—their teachers, and assistants. They were killed at their desks at Sandy Hook.

I thought that would make a difference. I thought there would be a national conversation about gun safety and the memory of those beautiful little children who died so senselessly because the person had a gun that gave them the power to kill them en masse. It didn't happen.

Then, when that gunman in the hotel in Las Vegas opened fire with a gun that he had converted into an automatic weapon and killed those

concertgoers at that country western concert, just shot at them at random, I thought: Now, that will make a difference. That is the moment when we can sit down and honestly talk about gun safety in America. It was so graphic, and it was so horrible that at least we can come together for a bipartisan conversation about making America a safer place for first graders in Connecticut, for concertgoers in Nevada, and for all of the many other gun tragedies we have had in America. It didn't happen. The President promised to do something. He didn't. What happened in the U.S. Senate in terms of addressing this issue? Nothing—nothing, not even an effort to keep guns out of the hands of people who have no business owning them: convicted felons, people who are mentally unstable. The types of guns that are for sale in the United States go far beyond any need for sport, hunting, and, in many cases, even self-defense. Yet we couldn't even open the conversation on gun safety in light of those horrible tragedies.

Then several weeks ago, a patrolman in Minneapolis put his knee on the neck of George Floyd, and America changed. You see that video, which we have all seen over and over again. It was so graphic, so real, so personal, you just cannot escape it. Here was a policeman, in 8 minutes and 46 seconds, killing George Floyd. What was the charge that he was being accused of? Perhaps passing a phony \$20 bill—a \$20 bill.

I think the image that still sticks with most of us, in the 8 minutes and 46 seconds as George Floyd died, were all the people begging the policeman to stop, imploring him: Please.

Floyd was crying out “I can't breathe! I can't breathe!” mentioning his mother's name in those desperate, final moments of his life as that patrolman stared into that video camera with those cold, hard eyes. You cannot escape the reality of that video moment and the impact it has had on America and beyond.

George Floyd's image and name are now the subject of rallies not just across America but around the world. In my own home State of Illinois, it is understandable that in cities like Chicago, which have a diverse population, that African Americans know what it is like to be the object of racial discrimination when it comes to law enforcement. What has amazed me in my home State and in many other places, with my colleagues, is that this is not just a conversation in the big cities of America.

This last Sunday afternoon at 4 o'clock I went to Jerseyville, IL, for a Black Lives Matter rally. What an unlikely location. I don't know many African-American families live in Jersey County or Jerseyville, but there aren't many. It didn't stop 300 to 400 people from gathering on the courthouse lawn to make clear that they want things to change when it comes to policing in America—and change, it must.

I want to salute my colleagues, particularly Senators BOOKER and HARRIS. They came together and put a bill in place with the Congressional Black Caucus, with KAREN BASS, a Congresswoman from California. It is a bicameral proposal that has been introduced now in the House and Senate. I am proud to be a cosponsor. It is comprehensive, and it takes into consideration the reality that these moments of historic opportunity come along very seldom, and when they come, we need to seize them to make a difference in this great Nation.

Let's not be halfhearted. Let's be committed to doing something that makes a difference, and that means a bipartisan effort.

TIM SCOTT is my friend, a Republican Senator from the State of South Carolina. I like him, and I respect him. He has done and said things that I think have made a real impact on this Nation. His observations as an African-American Senator from South Carolina and what he has gone through—not just in his State but in his life and even in Washington, DC—touch my heart. I know that they are genuine, and so is he. When he was chosen on the Republican side to lead the effort to come up with some way to bring justice to policing, I thought that was a good choice, and I still do.

Now we are off to a start in this conversation, but it is an unusual and awkward start. My colleagues, Senators BOOKER and HARRIS, put the legislative proposal, the Justice in Policing Act, on the floor and have described it in detail over the last several days. It has been there for those who support it, as I do, and for those who are critical. We are obviously looking at this from a lot of perspectives.

Yesterday, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a lengthy hearing on police misconduct, and there were references throughout to the Booker and Harris bill, as both of them serve on the Judiciary Committee. Senator SCOTT's bill we saw just a few hours ago, and Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor earlier to the Senate and said that we are moving to this bill. It will be the next item of business.

I am glad that Senator MCCONNELL now feels a sense of urgency when it comes to reforming policing. Now is the moment for us to work together to come up with a bipartisan bill that can pass the U.S. Senate. Let us not miss this opportunity, this historic moment, to do something that will make a difference.

How many times, how many commissions, how many agencies, how many experts have issued reports on dealing with racism in law enforcement in America? Scores of them.

Going back to the 1960s, the former Governor of Illinois, Otto Kerner's commission, that long ago—60 years ago—was considering the same issues, many of the same issues we are considering today.

The hearings yesterday brought in some talented people—experts—to talk

to us in the Senate Judiciary Committee about this measure and this challenge that we face—community leaders, civil rights activists, and experts on the subject. I think Senator GRAHAM, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the Republican side, would agree that hearings are important and we should continue them, but they are never enough.

We need to do something that the Senate rarely, if ever, does. We need to legislate. We ought to do it in a process that was established in this Senate generations ago, bringing this matter to the floor for amendment and debate.

I understand the numbers in the Senate. As the whip on the Democratic side, I think the skill that is necessary to succeed is to be able to count to 60. I learned that very early in my Senate career. We know what the numbers really are. There are 47 Democrats and 53 Republicans. If you need 60 votes in most procedural questions in any debate, it must be bipartisan. If it is going to be bipartisan, it means that people have to sit down and be willing to listen to one another and be willing to compromise. I think we can do that. I have seen it done.

I can remember 2 years ago when the Senate passed the FIRST STEP Act. I started on this mission 10 years ago, after the passage of the effort on the drug crimes bill in the House of Representatives over 20 years ago, it was clear that bill was fatally flawed. That law resulted in unjust outcomes, as well as ineffectiveness when it came to fighting drugs. I started 10 years ago to try to change it, to change the disparity between crack and cocaine sentencing guidelines. I managed to get some part of it done, but when I took on the bigger issue of mandatory minimum sentencing, which was involved in this, as well, I ran into a blockade by the name of CHUCK GRASSLEY.

CHUCK, the senior Senator from Iowa, didn't see eye to eye with my approach at all, and I realized my bill was going nowhere with him. He was chairman of the Judiciary Committee. We sat down for a year—for a year—and we came up with a bill we both agreed on. It wasn't what I wanted—it wasn't the original bill, by any means—and it wasn't what CHUCK GRASSLEY wanted. But we filed a good bill called the FIRST STEP Act, and he became the lead sponsor on the Grassley-Durbin bipartisan bill. That bill passed the House, passed the Senate, and was signed into law by President Donald Trump. Who would have guessed that Donald Trump would have signed a bill on criminal justice reform? But he did, and he bragged about it afterward and continues to this day. I guess the lesson learned here is if the right people sit down with the right goal, we can achieve an important victory for the American people.

I understand now, having been to these rallies of Black Lives Matter, how determined and desperate people are across the United States to see us change when it comes to racism and

law enforcement. They are desperate, primarily in our younger populations. It is interesting. Even the largest rallies are being led by high school students who are bringing together hundreds and, in some cases, thousands of people to peacefully demonstrate on behalf of justice in law enforcement. The message is pretty clear. They do not want to grow up and they don't want to raise their families in the shadow of racism.

We have fought this issue in America for over 400 years. That is how long it has been since slavery came to our shores. The racism that followed from it and was part of it is still very much alive in America and is seen in video after video. These young people are telling us once and for all: Change it, grownups. You are supposed to be in charge. You are supposed to have the authority.

So what we say on the Democratic side is that we cannot waste this historic moment, this singular opportunity. Let us not do something that is a token, halfhearted approach. Let us focus on making a change that will make a difference in the future of America.

When I take a look at the bill we put together, the Justice in Policing Act—again, I want to salute Senators BOOKER and HARRIS—we establish standards for criminal police misconduct under the law. We talk about qualified immunity reform. Allow me to say a word about this.

That was the one thing that Senator TIM SCOTT said on Sunday was a major sticking point on the Republican side. We discussed it yesterday in the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing. What does it mean? It means that if a policeman is guilty of discriminatory misconduct against a person, they can be liable for civil damages. An obvious case—if somebody is shot and killed and there is a belief that the policeman was guilty of misconduct in the process, that policeman can be found guilty in court and liable for civil damages to the family, much the same as wrongful death or personal injury. But the problem is that the courts have taken this qualified immunity and basically said that if you cannot find an identical fact pattern for that policeman's misconduct, you can't pursue the civil recovery of damages for the family who lost the breadwinner, for example. The argument for that position has been made by some Republicans that even if a patrolman or policeman has done something that is terribly wrong, you shouldn't take their home away from them to compensate that victim's family. So the Republicans have said that they don't want to change the qualified immunity standard.

Now let's move from that debate to the real world, and I know just a little bit about it. There was a sheriff in a downstate county in Illinois who was sued many years ago and accused of misconduct for imprisoning and mistreating prisoners in his county jail.

When he was sued in court, much the same as the qualified immunity situation I described earlier, he was defended in that court. Who defended that sheriff for his misconduct and potential damages that he owed to his victim? I didn't do it as a U.S. attorney or State's attorney or in any official public capacity. I did it representing an insurance company. DeWitt County, the county that employed the sheriff, considered him a county employee for their purposes and had bought an insurance policy which said that if there is any wrongdoing by county employees, the insurance company will pay whatever is owed. I represented the insurance company. We went forward with the case. The point I am getting to is that sheriff was not going to lose his home or car or motorcycle. It was a lawsuit being brought in court for that sheriff's responsibility in creating a loss to the plaintiff that merited damages from the court and jury. So this argument that we cannot hold policemen responsible for their misconduct on a civil basis for damages overlooks the obvious—that 99 to 100 percent of damages paid out are paid out not by the individual law enforcement official but usually by the insurance company. The insurance company indemnifies the defendants; in other words, it takes on the responsibility of defending them and paying out any verdict that is filed or any settlement that is reached.

Why would we want to go ahead and allow this civil recovery? Because it is a lesson learned for that county when it comes to the conduct and training and hiring of individuals. If they know that certain things are going to result in a liability—even through their insurance company, with higher insurance premiums as a result—they will think twice, won't they? It is human nature.

The opposite result is true. If the Republicans have their way and don't touch qualified immunity, then, in fact, you have created a defense wall for any potential defendant who is in law enforcement from civil liability, and you have taken away the incentive of their employer or that department to improve the way they administer justice. I think it is pretty obvious that if we want the right outcome, there should be a price to be paid for wrongdoing, and there certainly should be compensation for a victim's family.

So I don't understand the resistance on the Republican side. We need to talk because we cannot move forward on this issue of police responsibility and say there is a whole area of immunity when it comes to the police being sued for civil damages in court.

We also need pattern and practice investigations. What that means is there comes a moment when the Department of Justice needs to take a look at local police departments. I know about that. The shooting of Laquan McDonald in the city of Chicago was an event that still has an impact on the people who

live there. I joined with the attorney general, Lisa Madigan, in asking the Department of Justice to investigate the police department after the shooting of Laquan McDonald. It wasn't a popular decision with some people, but I thought it was the right thing to do. We will be better for it. The city of Chicago will make changes that need to be made, and I am sure there need to be more in the future, but extending and advancing pattern and practice investigations in the Department of Justice is long overdue. In the Obama administration over 20 of these investigations took place across America; under the Trump administration, one. It is time for the Department of Justice to do its job, and that is part of what we are setting out to do.

We also have the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act included in the Booker-Harris bill. Police departments lack uniform standards to ensure an adherence to best practices in communities of color with accountability. We call on the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to move them in the right direction of training and retraining when it comes to reducing the use of force and reducing the killings that are taking place that are unnecessary.

We need to establish a national police misconduct registry, which is part of the Booker-Harris bill, so no police officer who loses his or her job because of misconduct can go to a nearby jurisdiction or another State and escape the scrutiny of taking a review of the history they have as members of a police department.

We need to require States to report to the Justice Department incidents in which force is used against a civilian or against a law enforcement officer. I bet 99 percent of Americans believe there is automatic reporting, for example, of the shooting of unarmed people by police across the United States. There isn't. It turns out that the only source you can find is the Washington Post newspaper, which decided in 2015 to start collecting that information by reading news outlets and information and putting it all together. Let's get the data so we will understand if we are falling behind or making progress when it comes to the administration of justice.

We need to prohibit Federal, State, and local law enforcement from racial, religious, and discriminatory profiling. This is an issue I have been working on for years. Others feel the same. Profiling needs to come to an end. We know it is a real problem. We need real training on racial bias and a duty to intervene. This gets to the heart of policing.

Policing runs parallel to our military in the standards and rules that they operate under. We talk about peer intervention. We ask ourselves, why didn't the other three policemen in Minneapolis say to that policeman with his knee on the neck of George Floyd, "Stop. You are killing him"?

They didn't because of the so-called chain of command. We need to have peer scrutiny and peer intervention, particularly in life-and-death situations.

We believe we should ban the no-knock warrants in drug cases. We know what happened in the city of Louisville. We want to make certain it doesn't happen again.

We want a clear ban on choke holds and carotid holds. We want the police to exercise absolute care with everyone with a standard of reasonableness to prevent death and serious bodily injury.

Consider what happened in that Wendy's parking lot in Atlanta. There are a number of factors involved here, but what was at the heart of the issue? At the heart of the issue was a man who drank too much and fell asleep in his car in the drive-in line at Wendy's. That is what started the police call and everything that followed. At the end of 40 minutes, the man who fell asleep in his car was shot dead in that parking lot. When you try to bring and measure the response and the result against the original charge, it is like the \$20 counterfeit bill. You think to yourself: Did that merit pulling a gun and killing a man because he fell asleep in his car? He shouldn't have been driving while intoxicated, but there is no evidence he was involved in any accident. There was certainly a better way to bring that to a conclusion other than the confrontation that led to his death.

We also need the Camera Accountability Act, requiring Federal uniformed police officers to wear body cameras and have dashboard cameras and make sure they are operable. We also need to finally pass the Justice for Victims of Lynching Act. I spoke on that yesterday, and I will not dwell on it today, but this is long, long overdue.

One of the first Federal anti-lynching bills was introduced after World War I by a Republican Congressman in St. Louis named Leonidas Dyer, a World War I veteran who served as an officer in the Army. He was prosecuting attorney for St. Louis County. On July 1, 1917, there was a horrendous race riot in my hometown of East St. Louis, IL, where 7,000 African Americans were rousted out of their homes and forced to cross the bridges into the city of St. Louis to escape death. The estimates of how many were killed are just that, but they range in the hundreds of African Americans who were lynched and murdered.

As a result of that horrible experience in East St. Louis and the race riot, Congressman Dyer, Republican of St. Louis, introduced the Federal anti-lynching law. He passed it in the House of Representatives. There were 119 negative votes. Among the negative votes were four Members of the House who went on to become Speakers, but all four voted against the Dyer Federal anti-lynching bill. It was sent to the Senate where it died by design. A combination of those who opposed it, in-

cluding southern Democrats, stopped the bill from being considered. It faced a filibuster—end of story but not the end of lynching, by any means.

Lynching is a blight on America's history. There is absolutely no reason why we should not include the Federal anti-lynching statute, which passed the House 410 to 4, in this package that is being considered. I believe it may be part of Senator SCOTT's bill as well. I hope it will pass. I hope the one Senator on the other side of the aisle who has held it up can be convinced otherwise. History demands that we bring an end to this miserable, bloody chapter in American history, which touches so many of our States.

We have a job to do. We now have two bills, and we are seeing the Republican bill for the first time this morning. Many of us believe it is at least an indication of the urgency of the issue but not as responsive as it should be. Let us not escape this moment in history. Let us not avoid it. Let's face it, and let's use it. We can make this a better Nation. We can say to those young people, Black, White, and Brown, those young women and men who are leading the marches in my State and across the Nation: We hear you. We understand you want to grow up in a different world, in a different Nation. We understand that you want to see discrimination and racial mistreatment come to an end in this country. This generation, the ones who are elected to do something about it, will do just that. We will respond.

I hope what Senator MCCONNELL said this morning about opening this debate on the floor of the Senate is not just a one-and-done, take-it-or-leave-it approach on the majority side of the aisle. Let's have a real debate. Let's have real effort to find common ground. I think it can work.

Senator GRASSLEY and I proved that with the FIRST STEP Act, a bipartisan bill signed by President Trump that made a difference. Literally, thousands of Federal inmates were released from prison who had been serving lengthy, impossible-to-explain sentences for nonviolent drug activity. They are home now. They are back out of prison now, as they should be. They did it on a bipartisan basis, and we compromised to reach it.

Let us make sure that at the end of the day, what we do pass makes a difference in the future of America, not just a quick press release but something we can live with and be proud of for years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Montana.

H.R. 1957

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today, we will make history in the Senate. Today, we will vote on one of the most important conservation bills not just in years but in decades.

Today, we get one step closer to protecting our outdoor heritage for our children, our grandchildren, for future

generations of Montanans, and for all Americans because today we will be casting the final vote on this historic bipartisan bill entitled the "Great American Outdoors Act."

Today, for the first time ever in the U.S. Senate, we will vote to make funding for a critical conservation program, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, full and mandatory. This funding will protect the program and provide certainty for our land managers, for conservationists, for sports men and women.

I spoke with Montanans across our State about the importance of this program. What is interesting is no matter what the ideologies are, these ideologies across the board, from left to right—they agree that this program will protect our outdoors for current and future generations.

As a Senator from Montana, Big Sky Country—in fact, we like to call Montana "The Last Best Place"—I know just how important it is that we have access to our public lands and the opportunity to enjoy our outdoors. In fact, it is a major driver of our economy, the outdoor recreation economy.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund enables better public access to our public lands. It is going to help create jobs in a time when we need them the most. It will help protect wildlife habitat. It will help improve land management. It links conservation to a strong energy sector, and it costs the taxpayers nothing.

Today, by voting on the Great American Outdoors Act, we will also provide a significant downpayment to address the maintenance backlog that is facing our national parks and our public lands. I chair the National Parks Subcommittee here in the Senate. As a fifth-generation Montanan who grew up going to our national parks—I grew up in the shadows of Yellowstone National Park, just about 1½ hours from my home—because of enjoying the outdoors with my family, this has been one of my top priorities.

You see, our national parks and our public lands set us apart from the rest of the world, but our parks have seen an increase in visitation—in fact, record visitation for many of our parks. That is a really good thing.

Our park infrastructure is at risk of being loved to death, leading to dilapidated infrastructure that can compromise the visitor experience and safety. There is nearly \$12 billion in maintenance backlog facing our national parks across the Nation, including over \$700 million in Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks, an additional \$34 million throughout other national parks in Montana. We have a great opportunity today to address this by getting this bipartisan bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, done and passed out of the Senate and send it over to the House.

As a kid who grew up in Bozeman, I went to kindergarten through college in Bozeman. I was a Bozeman Hawk in



high school and proud Montana State University Bobcat. I know just how important it is to get this done for Montana.

I am also fortunate to have the opportunity to enjoy Montana outdoors with my sweet wife, Cindy, and our four children and our granddaughter, Emma, and soon-to-be new grandson in just a few months. You see, Montana's public lands are part of our Montana way of life. They are part of our heritage, who we are as Montanans.

I have been very fortunate to be able to fly fish many of Montana's rivers and their streams. In fact, my son took that picture of me up in the Beartooth a few years ago. I remember that distinctly. Just around the corner of where that picture was taken, I was working my way up that stream and got a real nice cutthroat and ripple. In fact, Cindy and I backpack in the Beartooth, in the wilderness area, every August. We take along two of our dogs, Ruby and Reagan. In fact, I took that picture of our son, Michael, up in the High Country of Montana. We get places like this where there are virtually no trails. This is wild country.

It is unique to the world that we have places that are so pristine and still remain so relatively untouched. My wife and I have instilled in our family the same passion and love for outdoors that we have shared for so long.

Here we are at a backpack, again, up in the Beartooth. This is not too far from Granite Peak, Montana's highest point. Some of our best memories are spending time with our son, Michael, there, the dog, Cindy, and me there.

I want to show you this next picture because that sums up probably who we are as a couple. We went back up to the Hyalite area south of Bozeman a few years ago. That peak is Hyalite Peak. Back in 1986, that is where I asked Cindy to marry me. We got engaged on top of that mountain, a peak over 10,000 feet high.

This is more than just some theological discussion that we are having today on the floor of the Senate. This is about protecting our Montana outdoor way of life. It is the very heart and soul of who we are as Montanans. In fact, since I came to Congress, I made it one of my highest priorities to protect and expand access to our public lands.

I am proud to be standing here today, ready to vote on this historic conservation bill. Today, I urge my colleagues—it doesn't matter whether you are a Democrat or Republican—to come together and pass this bipartisan bill that will benefit generations. I think we are going to have a really strong vote today. My sense is it will be an overwhelming affirmation of this important legislation. I look forward to seeing that. I look forward to passing the Great American Outdoors Act today, working to get it out of the House, which is our next step, and getting it onto President Trump's desk. I spoke with him today, and he is excited

to sign this historic piece of legislation into law. Montana is ready. I am ready. Let's get her done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to join my colleagues to talk about the final passage of the Great American Outdoors Act and to discuss what it really means to all of us.

Obviously, the great outdoors means a lot to the State of Washington. Nobody probably needs that explained to them. I recently read a quote from George Vancouver when he was discovering the Pacific Northwest. Even in his remarks, he was so astounded that this was such a beautiful place. It tells you it lasts for generations, and that is what this bill is about. This bill is making it last for generations beyond us.

I want to thank the bipartisan effort of five Democrats and five Republicans who joined together to originally put the parks' backlog and maintenance together by fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

People should realize that the Land and Water Conservation Fund, over its history—and I followed it closely because Scoop Jackson, a long-time Senator from the State of Washington and the original sponsor of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, understood that America was urbanizing, and we needed to make an investment in open space. That open space gives us park and recreational area.

It has literally provided 5 million acres of protected land since its inception. There are 5 million acres of land throughout the United States of America that we can identify in every State of the United States to give Americans access to open space.

I mentioned Gas Works Park in the State of Washington and Seattle because it is so iconic. I don't think people would think that Lake Union would be the same without Gas Works Park.

It was a great idea by the leaders of our Congress at the time to pass the Land and Water Conservation Act. We had a fight, literally, in the last 10 or 15 years between people who didn't want to fully fund or even support the Land and Water Conservation Act. We let it expire 2 years ago, and people were in an argument about how to reauthorize it. People then wanted to say that we don't really want to do new land; we want to take care of the backlog. That debate went on for a time.

I think we really tried to emphasize the great economy related to the outdoors because taking this revenue from oil and gas offshoring and putting it into land conservation has been a big win for the American people. Not only do they get open space and be able to recreate, but it puts money back into our economy as well because the outdoor economy is a big juggernaut at \$877 billion.

We are ending this debate today. We are ending this paradigm that has ex-

isted between some Members who have said: Yes, I care about the parks that are already there, and maybe we should take care of the backlog, but I don't want any new money going to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has dedicated across the United States 5 million acres as open space for all Americans to enjoy. That is a big win—ending this debate and ending this, I would say, misdirected discussion that tried to pit land against one another and, basically, people who didn't want more open space and public land.

I think we are ending that debate on a very firm note today that says the Senate really believes that open space is a great driver of our economy, but more importantly, it is an essential aspect of American life, and we are going to continue to invest in it.

For us in the State of Washington, we have received something like \$700 million over the life of this project since the 1960s. With this legislation today, we are basically making sure the Land and Water Conservation Fund dollars connected from offshore oil revenue is spent in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We will receive hundreds of millions more—between \$200 million and \$300 million more in Land and Water Conservation Fund investment.

I can't wait to see what that does for us in the Northwest. As I said, starting with George Vancouver and on down to today, everybody in the Northwest knows that the environment is so precious to us. It is great for its restorative value but also great for our economy so we want to keep it, and we want to keep investing in it.

The backlog and maintenance we are talking about is a phenomenal investment. I encourage all of my colleagues to visit Mount Rainier sometime if you are in the Pacific Northwest. You can drive up to Paradise and visit. Those roads and the facilities there need maintenance. Even several years ago we used the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the Carbon River improvement on a road that kept washing out every year, and now we moved it to higher ground, expanding the park. That makes it more beneficial for people to go to that side of the mountain as well.

I am reminded what Teddy Roosevelt said: "The nation behaves well if it treats the national resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased, and not impaired, in value."

That is what we are doing today. We are returning that value to the next generation.

I want to specifically thank Senator MANCHIN for his leadership on our side of the aisle on this. Having sponsored this legislation myself 2 years ago with Senator BURR and getting it out of the committee, we were sad to see that it got stuck on the Senate floor. We are glad this coalition of five Democrats



and five Republicans led by Senator GARDNER has managed to get it to this point.

I also want to mention that Senator BURR's leadership over the last two Congresses—actually, all the way back to 2010, where he fought to make sure that this Land and Water Conservation legislation was reauthorized and that we make this investment—has played a pivotal role in making sure that people understand what that investment means to the United States.

So a huge day for public lands in the U.S. Senate and a huge day to say that Americans will be getting more open space and that our parks will be getting a little bit of a facelift, if you will, around their roads and bridges and facilities, their trails, the management of our forests, the infrastructure that is entailed in giving public access to these public spaces.

It couldn't be a more important investment, and it couldn't give America a bigger return.

So I thank my colleagues. I look forward to getting this rapidly through the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this Nation faces an uncertain future. Gripped by a pandemic, economic disruption, and racial injustice, the American people are yearning for bold, forward-thinking leadership. Now is the time for elected leaders to stand up and make the investments necessary to secure a better world for our children and grandchildren. The Great American Outdoors Act, which I am proud to cosponsor, does that. While it addresses a narrow set of challenges and opportunities, it should remind us all that we are capable of meaningful, forward-looking action. If enacted, our bipartisan bill would be the most significant conservation achievement in more than 50 years and would provide benefits for generations to come.

Throughout my service in the Senate, it has been an honor to bring Vermont's values to Washington. And for Vermonters, stewardship of the land and water is a bedrock value. Our agrarian tradition, sense of place, and outdoor economy all rely on preserving open spaces and conserving our natural resources. This bill reflects those values on a grand scale.

The Great American Outdoors Act would secure full, permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. As is true for States across the country, the LWCF has played an unparalleled role in permanently protecting some of Vermont's most important and iconic landscapes, and I am proud to have been able to take a leading role in championing this program and these investments. In the 55 years since its creation, LWCF investments totaling nearly \$150 million have helped conserve more than 275,000 acres in Vermont. From the Green Mountain National Forest, to Camel's Hump, to the Long Trail and Green River Reservoir State Park, this program has

played a role in protecting Vermont's invaluable natural spaces. It has also helped Vermont towns conserve local treasures and facilities, such as Rutland's Pine Hill Park and the school playground in Pomfret.

As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I was proud to lead the creation of the Forest Legacy Program in the 1990 Farm Bill. This voluntary program recognizes the critical stewardship role that private landowners play by helping them conserve working forest lands. In so doing, the Forest Legacy Program supports timber sector jobs and the forest products economy, and it sustains all the other benefits provided by intact forests: outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife habitat, and air and water quality. Since the Forest Legacy Program's first project at Cow Mountain Pond in Vermont's Northeast Kingdom, more than \$39 million in Federal Forest Legacy funds have supported the permanent conservation of thousands of acres of private working forest lands in my State.

The conservation ethic embodied in this bill is not just about green mountains and open waters. This is a conservation bill, a stewardship bill, and a jobs bill. Passage of the Great American Outdoors Act would provide immediate and sustained economic stimulus to States and communities that desperately need it. Vermont's outdoor recreation sector alone contributes an estimate \$5.5 billion annually, supporting 51,000 jobs. Our forest products industry supports more than 10,000 jobs and generates nearly \$1.5 billion in economic output. Maintaining the land base that these sectors depend on through LWCF investments is essential to Vermont, particularly as our State's economy gets back on its feet. An analysis by the Trust for Public Land estimates that every dollar invested in LWCF returns \$4 in economic benefits. I call that a wise investment, particularly considering that LWCF is funded by revenue from offshore oil and gas leases.

The 116th Congress began with the passage of a sweeping, bipartisan public lands package, the John D. Dingell Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act. That bill established permanent authorization for LWCF. How fitting that we should continue the work we started by now establishing permanent funding for this legacy program and by finally addressing the maintenance backlog facing our National Parks and other public lands. During such an uncertain period for our Nation, it is clearer than ever that access to trails and public lands is essential for the physical, emotional, and economic health of every community. The Great American Outdoors Act embodies the spirit of stewardship that Vermonters have cultivated for generations, and I am proud to support it. We should celebrate the Senate's leadership today and thank the broad coalition of conservation stakeholders in

Vermont and across the country that has helped make this moment possible.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I am very pleased to support the Great American Outdoors Act. This is an effort that is many years in the making, so I am gratified the majority leader has taken this historic step for the future of our natural landscape.

When the President signs this bill into law, as he has indicated he will do, it will do two incredibly important things. It will finally, after 55 years, fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund at its authorized level. It will also address the deferred maintenance backlog in our national parks and public lands. This will be an historic achievement to preserve America's most treasured places for generations to come, and I could not be more proud to be a part of it.

As my colleagues know, I have long been a champion of LWCF. LWCF is America's most successful conservation program. It is effective. It is proven. And it costs taxpayers nothing. Over the years, LWCF has supported more than 42,000 outdoor recreation projects. It has benefited every State in the country. In North Carolina, it has helped preserve parks, trails, and outdoor sites from the Great Smoky Mountains to the Outer Banks. After a hard-fought battle by those of us who have long recognized LWCF's centrality to our conservation efforts, last year, Congress permanently authorized the program.

But there was still one essential piece missing: full funding. In recent years, the program consistently received less than half the amount it was authorized for. I must remind my colleagues that this was essentially theft from the program. It derives its own funding to achieve its \$900 million level, yet we have given it far less than that nearly every year it has been in existence. This bill will change that. Going forward, the \$900 million that annually flows into the fund will finally be fully dedicated to the good things LWCF provides, from securing access to recreational and hunting lands, to protecting watersheds and preserving habitats for wildlife and endangered species.

In addition to fully funding LWCF, the Great American Outdoors Act will address the deferred maintenance backlog in our national parks, forests, and fish and wildlife refuges. My home state of North Carolina is blessed with some of the most iconic public lands in the world: Great Smokies National Park, the Blue Ridge Parkway, Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout National Seashores, Pisgah National Forest, and Lake Mattamuskeet National Wildlife Refuge, just to name a few. Millions visit these special places each year, and they support tens of thousands of jobs.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government has not been able to provide the resources necessary to maintain these treasures at the level they deserve. For

example, at the Blue Ridge Parkway, as of 2018, the maintenance backlog was over \$500 million, but the parkway receives only \$15 to \$20 million a year for maintenance work. This bill will help fill those gaps by dedicating \$1.9 billion a year from energy development on Federal lands to address maintenance needs at our national parks and public lands.

We would not be here without the efforts of many people, but I would like to give special thanks to our colleagues CORY GARDNER and STEVE DAINES. I have been on the frontlines on this issue for years, and I know they worked extremely hard to build the bipartisan coalition behind this bill. I would also like to thank my colleagues on both sides who I have worked with for years to get to this point on LWCF: JOE MANCHIN, MARIA CANTWELL, LAMAR ALEXANDER, and many others.

I encourage each and every Senator here today to support this critical legislation. Future generations will thank them for it.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to add my support for the passage of the Great American Outdoors Act.

This landmark bipartisan bill directs significant funding to public lands nationwide, which will benefit communities across the country. This investment will continue to pay dividends for future generations.

The purpose of this legislation is twofold. First, it provides \$900 million per year in permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which supports the protection of Federal public lands and waters, including national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and recreation areas, and voluntary conservation on private land.

Importantly, this dedicated new funding would come from a portion of royalties on offshore oil and gas development, not the American taxpayer.

Secondly, the bill establishes the National Park and Public Lands Legacy Restoration Fund. Similar to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, this is also funded through onshore and offshore energy revenues over 5 years, up to \$1.9 billion annually for a total of \$9.5 billion.

Its sole purpose is to address the deferred maintenance needs of the National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Bureau of Indian Education.

Currently, the National Park Service alone has a backlog of approximately \$12 billion. This legislation will go a long way in helping to complete priority maintenance projects across America's public lands.

As we face a severe economic crisis as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, I particularly want to highlight the fact that this legislation before us today is more than just a public lands bill; it is also a jobs bill that will help fulfill Congress's commitment to make public lands accessible to all Americans.

The National Park System welcomed a record 327 million visitors last year, adding nearly \$42 billion to our national economy and supporting more than 340,000 existing jobs.

According to Pew Charitable Trusts, this bill would also create 110,000 additional jobs repairing infrastructure in our national parks.

The Great American Outdoors Act also upholds Congress's long-standing commitment to ensuring access for all Americans to public lands.

My hope is the investments made by this legislation will continue to fulfill the purposes laid out in the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, articulated as "... preserving, developing, and assuring accessibility to all citizens of the United States of America of present and future generations ... and to strengthen the health and vitality of the citizens of the United States."

As our population continues to grow, it is even more vital to help all communities, regardless of race or income levels, enjoy access to America's beautiful open spaces, historical sites, and natural wonders.

California is home to nine national parks—more than any other State—and we understand the tremendous value our public lands provide.

According to the National Park Service, in 2019, 39.6 million park visitors spent an estimated \$2.7 billion in local communities while visiting National Park Service lands in California. These expenditures supported a total of 36,000 jobs and \$4.3 billion in economic output.

That is an impressive amount by any measure, and I have witnessed the power of investments in our national parks with my own eyes in places like the California desert.

For example, in 1994, I was proud to help enact the California Desert Protection Act which designated Joshua Tree as a national park and protected an additional 234,000 acres.

Today, Joshua Tree is one of the most visited national parks in the country and welcomed 3 million visitors in 2019, according to the National Park Service. These visitors spent approximately \$150 million in local communities surrounding the park and supported 1,860 jobs.

In addition, California has been the largest recipient of Land and Water Conservation funds in the program's five-decade history. This funding has helped protect beloved places like the Lake Tahoe Basin, California Desert, Point Reyes National Seashore, Headwaters Forest, San Diego and Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuges, and the National Forests of the Sierra Nevada.

According to a recent study, every \$1 million spent from the Land and Water Conservation Fund supports as many as 30 jobs. Simply stated, an investment in our public lands is an investment in the health, welfare, and economies of our communities.

In closing, I would like to thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the

aisle who came together to prioritize these investments in our Nation's prized public lands and the communities that rely on them.

Thank you.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to reflect on land conservation as the Senate is poised to make an historic commitment to our public lands and waters. S. 3422, the Great American Outdoors Act, contains two core components. The first establishes the National Park Service and Public Lands Legacy Restoration Fund to support deferred maintenance projects on Federal lands. The second makes funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund permanent. Taken together, these policies will conserve land for the enjoyment of the public for generations to come and ensure that we continue to protect our shared resources.

The Restoration Fund must be used for priority deferred maintenance projects that are administered by the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Indian Education. Our National Parks desperately need help, a situation President Trump's disastrous 2018–2019 shutdown exacerbated. There is an estimated \$11 billion maintenance backlog within the National Park System alone. Visitor numbers have increased in recent years and are likely to continue to do so, particularly as the public seeks respite at available units from the constraints that the novel coronavirus—COVID-19—pandemic has placed on daily life. Parks have been indispensable assets for communities during the ongoing public health emergency, allowing people to exercise and enjoy the outdoors safely with precautions, including staying local, practicing physical distancing, and using face coverings.

The LWCF is one of our Nation's most successful conservation programs. Congress established the LWCF in 1964. Since then, it has protected nearly 5 million acres of Federal lands and supported over 41,000 State and local projects through matching grants. LWCF has enjoyed bipartisan support since its inception; however, permanent funding will provide the fund with the long-term security and stabilization it deserves.

Maryland has benefited immensely from Federal investment in public land. Open spaces are particularly important to just over 6 million Marylanders who live and recreate in a highly developed State. Outdoor enthusiasts have a significant economic impact on the Maryland communities they visit. In 2019, nearly 7 million park visitors spent an estimated \$233 million in local gateway regions while visiting National Park Service lands in Maryland. These expenditures supported 2,960 jobs, \$117 million in labor income, and \$313 million in economic output in the Maryland economy, according to the latest annual report, National Park Visitor Spending Effects.

Consideration of this legislation coincides with Chesapeake Bay Awareness Week—June 6–14, 2020—leading up to the 6-year anniversary of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. The agreement outlines five themes with 10 goals for the restoration and protection of the watershed region, including conserved lands, engaged communities, and climate change. On June 16, 2014, the Chesapeake Executive Council signed the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. Signatories include representatives from the entire watershed, committing for the first time the seven headwater jurisdictions—Maryland, Delaware, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia—to a full regional partnership with State, Federal, local, and academic watershed organizations in the Chesapeake Bay Program.

Permanently funding the LWCF furthers the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement—foremost, the land conservation goal: to conserve landscapes treasured by citizens in order to maintain water quality and habitat; sustain working forests, farms, and maritime communities; and conserve lands of cultural, indigenous, and community value. Stormwater runoff from urban and suburban areas is the fastest growing contributor of pollution to the Chesapeake Bay. While States have improved their urban and suburban stormwater regulatory programs, overall loads in the sector continue to increase due to population growth and development. Land conservation is a powerful tool for reducing this type of runoff. Protecting open spaces and sensitive natural areas reduces the water quality and flooding impacts of stormwater runoff, while providing recreational opportunities for residents.

Public lands serve as essential cultural education centers, as is the case with the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park. Congress established this park in 2014 in Cambridge, MD, within the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge, a LWCF beneficiary site. The park memorializes the life of American hero Harriet Tubman, known for her contributions as a Civil War spy and nurse, suffragist, abolitionist, and Underground Railroad agent. The park allows visitors to explore the landscape in Dorchester County where Harriet Tubman was born into slavery. This unit is crucial to understanding Maryland's history and celebrating the life of Harriet Tubman and complements the stewardship goal to increase the number and diversity of local citizen stewards and local governments that actively support and carry out the conservation and restoration activities that achieve healthy local streams, rivers, and a vibrant Chesapeake Bay.

The LWCF advances the Climate Resiliency Goal to increase the capacity of the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including its living resources, habitats, public infrastructure and communities,

to withstand adverse impacts from changing environmental and climate conditions. With more than 3,000 miles of coastline, Maryland is particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts related to sea level rise, increased flooding, and extreme weather events according to the Maryland Commission on Climate Change and numerous peer-reviewed scientific studies. While advanced technology is necessary to combat climate change, we must not forget nature's carbon sink: our wetlands and forests. Natural capital, also known as green infrastructure, is a cost-effective way to support sustainability, including by protecting water resources and enhancing resilience. LWCF funds, particularly grants through the Forest Legacy Program, have enormous dividends by protecting forests and wetlands that have the natural ability to store excess carbon via photosynthesis. Best management practices can help protect these stores of carbon and the ability of forests and wetlands to sequester it. While this legislation is not explicitly linked to climate change, it is an example of how we can find commonsense, bipartisan climate change solutions.

LWCF programs are also terrific examples of successful partnering with State and local government and private partners. Broad Creek in Dublin, MD, is an excellent example of forest stewardship in a rapidly urbanizing landscape. The Baltimore Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America owns this 1,964-acre property located within the Chesapeake Bay watershed and uses it for national and regional Boy Scout events. Several Federal- and State-listed rare, threatened and endangered species exist on the property. LWCF supported this conservation effort while supporting Boy Scout and environmental education activities, in Harford County, MD, in line with the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement's environmental literacy goal: Enable students in the region to graduate with the knowledge and skills to act responsibly to protect and restore their local watershed.

For Conquest Waterfront Preserve, \$1,750,000 in LWCF resources helped protect Maryland's Eastern Shore. This 76-acre acquisition helped complete a 758-acre waterfront park in Queen Anne's County in partnership with the State, county, and the fund. Situated on a peninsula with 5 miles of shoreline along the Chester and Corsica Rivers, the project preserves important waterfowl habitat and wetland areas and expands public access to the Chesapeake Bay—another Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement goal: Expand public access to the Bay and its tributaries through existing and new local, State and Federal parks, refuges, reserves, trails, and partner sites.

Communities across the globe are asking their leaders to consider how their policy decisions affect all of their constituents. The Great American Outdoors Act expands our opportunities

for growth as a nation. This historic legislation represents the product of concerted bipartisan effort to invest in our Nation's future. By investing in our National Parks and other similar assets, we are helping to conserve our natural environment and create educational, accessible spaces for future generations of visitors. I am proud of what this body has accomplished and urge enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act into law.

I do have one regret. I understand the legislation represents a carefully crafted compromise, but I think it is unfortunate that Senators have not been able to offer amendments to the bill. I filed an amendment, S. Amdt. 1636, to establish a Fallen Journalists Memorial here in Washington, DC. June 28 will mark the 2-year anniversary of the fatal shooting that occurred at the offices of the Capital Gazette, a newspaper serving Annapolis, MD. I based my amendment on legislation I introduced, S. 1969, the Fallen Journalists Memorial Act, which Senator PORTMAN, Senator MANCHIN, and 10 other Senators have cosponsored. The amendment reflects changes the House Natural Resources Committee made when it marked up the bill and ordered it to be reported favorably by voice vote. The changes the committee made, in turn, reflect input from stakeholders including the National Park Service, which supports the bill. The legislation is bipartisan, noncontroversial, and does not impose any cost to taxpayers. The memorial would serve as a fitting tribute to the Gazette's staff and to all other journalists who have died in the line of duty and to our Nation's commitment to a free press. I hope that I can work with Senators MURKOWSKI and MANCHIN, the chair and ranking member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, respectively, to secure this bill's passage as soon as possible.

Ms. CANTWELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, in a few minutes, we are going to be voting to pass the Great American Outdoors Act, and before this bill crosses the finish line, I thought it would be a good opportunity to reflect upon all the work that it took to get us here today.

You see my colleagues around. This has truly been a labor of love from all of us who love the outdoors. If there is one thing we have found about the outdoors, it is no matter whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, you love it. We all participate in it; we all enjoy it; and we want to pass it on to our children and grandchildren and next generations to come.

I am proud to be joined by every Member of the Democratic caucus in supporting this legislation to permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to put \$9.5 billion toward maintenance backlogs on our treasured public lands, and I am very appreciative and very proud to be working with our Republican friends who are joining us to support the Great American Outdoors Act. It truly has been bipartisanship at its best, and it is something we need so much more of.

Passing permanent LWCF authorization last year was an important step, but securing a permanent, dedicated funding source for the multiple conservation programs funded by the LWCF has been the ultimate goal of the Democratic leaders of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee all the way back to Senator Jeff Bingaman. So it goes back quite a ways.

Many other Senators, Democratic and Republican, Members of the House, both retired and here today, have been champions for the LWCF and helped to pave the way to where we are today. We are within striking distance of realizing the goal of permanent, mandatory funding, especially since we have only seen the full funding twice in 55 years. To have it now, where it is going to be permanent, and the \$21 billion that went down the black hole, that will no longer happen. We will be able to make sure that the projects in all of our wonderful States—and I think almost every county in the country is going to benefit. It is on a personal basis. It truly is a long, hard-fought caucus achievement, and I am incredibly proud that as the current ranking member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, as a sponsor of the LWCF Permanent Funding Act, and one of the lead Democrats on this bill to be part of getting this legislation done.

I have my good friend Senator HEINRICH of New Mexico, who has worked so hard. Then we have had Senator CANTWELL. We have had Senator RON WYDEN and all who have been former chairs of the committees or ranking members. On the Republican side, all my colleagues there will be speaking on behalf of bringing so many people together.

So its time has come. It is a testament to the importance of this historic conservation legislation that has brought so many of us together in support. Something this impactful doesn't happen overnight. It takes time and hard work. I would like to recognize the work of my colleagues and thank them again.

We had a lot of votes. We have had a lot of votes that we have had to shepherd through and make sure that everybody understood how important, how historic, and the timing of something—to be able to say that you were in this body, you were able to vote and participate on a piece of legislation so our country, the United States of

America, is going to be able to share with every inhabitant we have and all the visitors coming from around the world for years and years and generations to come, that is pretty historic. To have that happen, I think, is one of the most important things we have done in the conservation world in the last 50 years.

So we are very proud of that. Sixty of my Senate colleagues have cosponsored the Great American Outdoors Act, and 20 more joined us last week, resulting in strong bipartisan votes to begin consideration of the historic bill. The beauty of our Nation's great outdoors truly brings them together.

All of us have been able to speak and show you pictures of our wonderful, beautiful States. These are some beautiful pictures from my beautiful State of West Virginia. This is Cheat River Canyon here. Anybody who has ever rafted that or hiked it or been on top and looked down to the beautiful vista, this is just truly as rugged as it looks right here. It is something gorgeous when you pass through it on a raft. It is really unbelievable.

I would invite everybody to come and visit. We are only a 5-hour drive from about half the population of the United States, right here in West Virginia.

This other photo is of the Dolly Sods Wilderness, a beautiful place. This is what we call Bear Rocks. I have a little, little place right down in the Canaan Valley area here, and I intend to be there this weekend with my family. This is something we enjoy. This is an unbelievable vista here. Again, it is only 3 hours from Washington, DC, by driving.

So we invite you all to West Virginia. We would love everybody to come visit and enjoy what sometimes we take for granted. When you have these types of views, you can never take that for granted, what the Good Lord gave us all. Every one of our States has so much to offer.

At the end of the day, this is an opportunity for us to pass down a legacy to our kids, our grandkids, and of course generations to come.

I believe this will be the most impactful nationwide conservation legislation since the Land and Water Conservation Fund was first created over 50 years ago.

From what we have seen from the votes over the last week and a half, I anticipate we will see again today. It is a shining example of Democrats and Republicans coming together to put politics aside to do what is best for conserving this great Nation's natural resources.

So I would like to say thank you to all of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of all of my staff who have worked on this. I am sure my friends on the Republican side would do the same because there has been a lot of effort put forth. People have worked long nights and long weekends to make this happen.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 1957—GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT  
STAFF (SENATOR MANCHIN)

David Brooks, Democratic General Counsel; Renae Black, Democratic Staff Director; Sam Fowler, Democratic Chief Counsel; Samantha Runyon, Democratic Communications Director; Bryan Petit, Democratic Senior Professional Staff Member; Elliot Howard, Democratic Professional Staff Member; Melanie Thornton, Democratic Professional Staff Member; Charlotte Bellotte, Democratic Research Assistant; Adam Berry, Democratic Research Assistant; Cameron Nelson, Democratic Research Assistant; Jeremy Ortiz, Democratic Digital Manager; Peter Stahley, National Park Service Bevinetto Fellow; Lance West, Chief of Staff; Wes Kungel, Legislative Director.

Mr. MANCHIN. I have got David Brooks, who has been on the committee for 30 years. He probably knows more about this process. I know he is fretting over is every word right, is every comma in the right place, every dot in the right place, but we have confidence in David and Sam Fowler and Renae Black doing a great job with the committee on the ranking member's side.

To every one of them who have worked so hard, thank you. God bless each and every one of them for a job well done, and it is something that we can all take pride in.

Someone said: How was your work in the Capitol? I said: We had a great week. We had a great week, and today is going to be the culmination of that great week.

So I want to thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to make these comments. I want to make sure we enter into the RECORD all the people who deserve the credit. I want to thank my colleagues for being here also.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from the great State of West Virginia for his work on this over the past many, many years, as we have worked on, individually, the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Restore Our Parks Act, for his leadership on the Energy and Natural Resources committee. I am grateful to Senator MANCHIN for his leadership and friendship.

So many people worked on this together: Senator BURR and the work he did, tirelessly, year after year, on the Land and Water Conservation Fund; of course, Senator HEINRICH, Senator WARNER, Senator PORTMAN, Senator ALEXANDER on the Restore Our Parks Act, Senators KING, CANTWELL—all crucial to the success this bill will see today—Senators across both sides of the aisle coming together for what one newspaper in Colorado described as the holy grail of conservation legislation.

But it is the staff as well. I start with Senator DAINES and his leadership on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Restore Our Parks Act, his

leadership on the Parks Subcommittee and the Great American Outdoors Act; Senator DAINES and his staff, Jason Thielman, Darin Thacker, Joshua Sizemore, Holly Hinojosa; Senator WARNER, Elizabeth Falcone, Micah Barbour; Senator PORTMAN, along with Pam Thiessen and Sarah Perry—incredible work by staff members.

In Senator KING's office we were greatly aided by Chad Metzler and Morgan Cashwell; Senator ALEXANDER's great team of David Cleary, Allison Martin, and Anna Newton; Senator CANTWELL's, Amit Ronen; and Senator MCCONNELL, Terry Van Doren.

Obviously, for the floor time, I am very grateful to Senator MCCONNELL for bringing us to the floor to allow this debate to take place over the last week and a half and the work that we did to achieve and secure the President's support for the Great American Outdoors Act.

Senator HEINRICH, Lio Barrera, Maya Hermann; Senator MANCHIN, Lance West, Renae Black, David Brooks; Senator BURR's staff of Natasha Hickman, Joshua Bowlen; and of course on my team, the outstanding work—they have to overcome a lot working with me, Ashley Higgins, Spencer Hamilton, Dustin Sherer, Jennifer Lorain, and Curtis Swager. I am grateful to all of them for their work and their support.

The Great American Outdoors Act is the culmination of two things that have taken this Congress a long time to be able to pass. In fact, we tried last Congress to get it out of the House, and we couldn't do it alone under the Restore Our Parks Act. We tried and we got pieces and parts of the Land and Water Conservation Fund done, but we couldn't quite get the whole thing until we brought these two bills together.

Senator MANCHIN, Senator BURR, Senator DAINES—the whole group of people whom I mentioned, working bipartisan across the aisle to make this happen.

The two bills together will help create significant opportunity for all of America. This isn't a bill that just benefits the East or the West. This isn't a bill that just benefits the coastal States or the interior States.

This is a chart that shows the States that benefit from the Great American Outdoors Act. The States that are in green shows who benefits from the Great American Outdoors Act. The States in orange are the States that do not get the benefit from the Great American Outdoors Act.

There are no States in orange. The entire country, from Alaska and Hawaii to Florida and Maine and everywhere in between, benefits from the Great American Outdoors Act.

We know this is going to create jobs across the country: \$495 million dollars a year in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. For every \$1 million a year invested in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it supports between 16 and 30 jobs. This bill will as-

sure full and permanent funding in the Land and Water Conservation Fund—\$900 million a year—the opportunity to create between 16 and 30 jobs for every \$1 million spent.

On national parks, you think about the national park economic benefits. In 2018, economic benefits from national park visitor spending increased by over \$2 billion. If you look at the number of just in Colorado alone, we had 7.6 million national park visitors. Those visitors helped create 7,000—over 7,000 jobs paying over \$258 million in income.

Overall, we know this bill on the park side alone will create over 100,000 jobs—100,000 jobs in the communities that were hardest hit by the first waves of the coronavirus; communities in our public lands that saw their ski areas shut down, their outfitters canceled.

This will create jobs and opportunity. In Colorado, thousands of jobs will be created by this portion of the bill alone.

You know, it has been said by some of our greatest advocates that within our national parks is room—glorious room—in which to find ourselves, in which to think and hope, to dream and plan, to rest and resolve.

In 1893, Katharine Lee Bates visited Colorado Springs and climbed up Pikes Peak. While looking out over the land, she wrote a poem that we all know very well. She wrote the words to “America the Beautiful”—of spacious skies and amber waves of grain. She talked about purple mountain majesties.

Our lands define who we are—our struggles and triumphs, our homes and our futures. From the solemnity of the redwoods to the vastness of the everglades, they inspire us and give us space to dream. In Hawaii, these lands crackle as new Earth forms from molten rock. In Pennsylvania, they bear the blood of a nation on the hallowed grounds of Gettysburg and Flight 93. In Colorado, they are a testament to prairie and peak, to plateau and pioneer. From sea to shining sea, our public lands are the story of America.

All of these lands—every single acre—tell the story of a nation formed out of hope for fairness, justice, equality, and freedom. Acre after acre shows our Nation's continued struggle to form a more perfect Union, a nation never content but committed to learning from the mistakes of the past to become a better place tomorrow than we are today, and to assure the Nation's greatest treasure, our youth, has these lands to learn from, to live with, and to prosper on for generations to come. Long after this Congress adjourns, they will give life to America, these great and wild places.

In just a few minutes, we will take a vote on a very historic piece of legislation, and I hope that my colleagues will find it within them to vote yes on this important piece of legislation for generations to come.

I yield the floor to Senator HEINRICH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Colorado. I really thank my colleague from West Virginia and the incredible teamwork that has played out here on the U.S. Senate floor.

This is a time in our country when we don't always have that kind of teamwork. Let's be honest. This has been a year when much of the country has been divided, but we have been able to come together around the one thing that truly unites us. Certainly, in having lived through the last 3 months, when many people have been shuttered in their homes for weeks and weeks at a time, I think it has really driven home for many of us that the outdoors is not just a luxury but is something we need.

I see we are now joined by my colleague from Montana as well, who did great work on this, which also drives home the fact that nothing around here gets done by one single individual or one party. It gets done when we come together.

I want to take just a minute and thank Senator Jeff Bingaman, who held my seat before I did, who made this the centerpiece of his work while he was in the Senate and plowed the ground on which we walk today.

I thank all of my staff, especially Maya Hermann and Lio Barrera, for all of their good work. I also thank Senator GARDNER for recognizing all of those on our staff—all of the good people who made this happen.

In New Mexico, we have protected such incredible landscapes with the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Valles Caldera—New Mexico's Yellowstone—is known for its herds of elk, its hot springs, its enormous volcanic caldera, and places like Ute Mountain that wouldn't be in the public trust were it not for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I was so proud to work with Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER on a bill called Every Kid Outdoors. This is the bill that will allow us to make sure that every kid will be within walking distance of a neighborhood park.

I hope that all of our colleagues will find it in their hearts to support this legislation today and will send a strong message to the House of Representatives to take up this legislation quickly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 121 Leg.]

#### YEAS—73

Alexander	Gillibrand	Roberts
Baldwin	Graham	Rosen
Bennet	Grassley	Rubio
Blumenthal	Harris	Sanders
Blunt	Hassan	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Boozman	Hirono	Scott (SC)
Brown	Hoeven	Shaheen
Burr	Jones	Sinema
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Capito	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Loeffler	Thune
Collins	Manchin	Tillis
Coons	McConnell	Udall
Cortez Masto	McSally	Van Hollen
Cotton	Menendez	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Warren
Daines	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wicker
Durbin	Perdue	Wyden
Ernst	Peters	Young
Feinstein	Portman	
Gardner	Reed	

#### NAYS—25

Barrasso	Hawley	Risch
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Braun	Inhofe	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Sasse
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Lankford	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	
Fischer	Paul	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Markey	Murray
--------	--------

The bill (H.R. 1957), as amended, was passed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1618

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the title amendment No. 1618 be considered and agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1618) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Education, and to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.”.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, John Boozman, Joni Ernst, Todd Young, Steve Daines, Cory Gardner, Jerry Moran, James E. Risch, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Ben Sasse, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott, Lamar Alexander, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 122 Leg.]

#### YEAS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Loeffler	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

#### NAYS—46

Baldwin	Harris	Sanders
Bennet	Hassan	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Booker	Hirono	Shaheen
Brown	Jones	Sinema
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Leahy	Udall
Collins	Manchin	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Gillibrand	Rosen	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Markey	Murray
--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this morning, the Senate narrowly invoked cloture on the nomination of Justin Walker to the DC Circuit. Within the week, the Senate is expected to confirm, by the thinnest margins, both Judge Walker and a separate nominee, Cory Wilson, to the Fifth Circuit. That fills the final two available seats on the circuit courts. In one case, there isn't a vacancy yet, but he is preemptively filling it. This will complete Leader MCCONNELL's rush to pack our appellate courts with President Trump's nominees.

I want to speak about this because I have had more experience on nominations, only because of tenure, than anybody else in this body. I note that both Judge Walker and Judge Wilson are partisan ideologues who have given no indication that they will leave their politics outside the courtroom. This has become par for the course under this President—choosing nominees not for their judicial qualifications and in spite of their political leanings but because of those partisan leanings. Extreme partisanship has become a qualifier, not a disqualifier. It is a prerequisite.

My Republican friends may consider these confirmations a great achievement; however, I fear that the damage left in the wake of their effort—to the courts, to the Senate, to the country—is going to remain with us for years to come after most of us have probably left this body.

Let us consider the backdrop in which we consider these nominees. We are in the throes of a global pandemic that has taken almost 120,000 American lives. It has plunged our economy into a deep recession. It has deprived nearly 45 million Americans of their jobs, something I have never seen in my years here in the Senate. Yet are we here today considering legislation that further assists Americans struggling during this pandemic? Indeed, we have done nothing to respond to COVID-19 for months even though the House passed \$3 trillion in further assistance last month.

The Senate today is not working together to find bipartisan meaningful ways to address the plagues of racial and social inequality, despite the fact that we see millions of Americans of all backgrounds, ages, creed, and color who flood our streets and squares with protests in the wake of the murder of George Floyd.



What are we doing to respond as a body? We are busy processing and confirming an endless stream of partisan ideologues, such as Justin Walker and Cory Wilson, to our Federal courts. I think it has to be noted, again, that Judge Walker, who is a protege of Senator McConnell, has been nominated to a seat that isn't even vacant until September.

It would be one thing if we were coming together in the Senate across party lines to confirm mainstream nominees, something we have done so many times in years past, but nothing about Judge Walker and Judge Wilson is mainstream. Judge Walker is not shy about his overt partisanship. He is openly hostile to the Affordable Care Act, even though the Affordable Care Act has provided a critical lifeline to millions of Americans during this pandemic. He has dangerously suggested that the FBI Director—whom we provided with a 10-year term to avoid politicization—“must think of himself as an agent of the President.” One can see why President Trump is interested in a nominee like him. People should worry about somebody who would want the FBI Director—who is supposed to treat everybody the same and just uphold the law—to be, instead, an instrument of whoever is present. Even if we ignore his hyperpartisan writings and countless cable news appearances before he became a district court judge—and that was just a few months ago, last fall—he has already shown he does not leave politics at the door when he puts on his robes. Even his judicial investiture ceremony could have been a lead-in for a Trump campaign rally, where he lamented that his legal principles have not yet prevailed and feared losing “our courts and this country” to his critics. These may be the words of Judge Walker, but they are not the words of any other judge I have ever known, Republican, Democrat, Independent. This judge wears his partisanship as a badge of honor, knowing that it will only appeal to a President who knows nothing of the role of the Federal judiciary and, sadly, knowing it will not deter this Senate from confirming him.

Judge Cory Wilson is no better. Again, I spoke about the Affordable Care Act, which has provided help to millions of Americans during the coronavirus epidemic. What does he call it? He calls the Affordable Care Act “perverse” and “illegitimate.” Golly, how would he vote on that? I wonder if those Americans—Republicans and Democrats alike—who are receiving lifesaving care through the ACA would call the law perverse.

He has attacked President Obama in ugly, personal terms, berating him as a “fit-throwing teenager” and “shrill, dishonest, and intellectually bankrupt.” That is a good attitude to hold when you are coming to the Senate as a Federal judge where you are supposed to be impartial. Such baseless accusations were laughable when he made them. They are beyond parody today.

Judge Wilson has a long record of undermining minority voting rights and dismissing the scourge of voter suppression, which we saw again last week during primary elections. He dismisses that as “phony,” even though everybody watching the news, from the right to left, can see it happening.

What message do these nominees of President Trump send to the country in this moment? Well, it says that the Republicans in the Senate are fast-tracking nominees who are eager to overturn the Affordable Care Act in the midst of a public health pandemic. They are fast-tracking nominees who are dismissive of racial injustices in the midst of a national reckoning on racial injustices.

The Senate has a constitutional duty to provide advice and consent to a President's nominee. When I came to the Senate, that meant something. It meant something under both Republican leadership and Democratic leadership. It meant something with both Republican and Democratic Presidents. But under this President, that constitutional duty has meant no more than serving as a mindless conveyor belt to rubberstamp nominees, however unqualified, however extreme, and however inappropriate at the moment.

You couldn't have two more inappropriate nominees at a time when we need healthcare because of the coronavirus or so inappropriate at a time when we are trying to do away with racial tensions and address the racial tensions of our country. It says that we don't believe in our standing as a coequal branch of government and that the Senate is willing to have that position as a coequal branch of government diminished.

Worse is the damage we inflict upon our courts. The Senate has now reshaped our Federal courts, especially our appellate courts, to resemble an extreme partisan arm of the Republican Party. For generations, Americans have valued our judiciary for its independence, a place where all Americans—of any political party or background, race, or belief—believed they could obtain fair and impartial justice. That is changing every day under President Trump.

When I tried cases before Federal courts at the district level or the appellate level—and the same with State courts at the trial level and the appellate level—I never worried that I would come before that court and my political beliefs would in any way affect the outcome. What I thought would affect the outcome would be the facts and the law. I have appeared before courts of appeals and Federal courts of appeals. Most of the time I had no idea what the political position or political party of the judge was. Yet today, anybody who comes in trying a case or appealing a case has to say: No matter what my facts are or no matter what the law is, I have to face a partisan ideology with a judge who is supposed to be non-partisan. We have seen fair and impar-

tial justice, as I said, changing every day under President Trump.

I have to hope that the Senate can rediscover its better angels. I can hope that we can again reassert ourselves as the crucible in which the great issues of the day are debated heatedly but resolved amicably, across party lines. I hope that one day the Senate will again serve as the conscience of the Nation, as it has during so many moments of upheaval and uncertainty in our history.

Today, more than any other time since I have been here, when we should be the conscience of the Nation, we are keeping that conscience locked up behind closed doors.

I hope, one day soon, the Senate will again demand—as it has under Republican and Democratic leadership in the past—that our President's judicial nominees are deserving of lifetime appointments to our Federal courts, possessing the qualifications and temperament that, until now, were rarely in question and now, time and again, are in question.

I ask my colleagues to go back to being the U.S. Senate. We owe it to ourselves. We owe it to the Constitution. Most of all, we owe it to the American people. Let the Senate once again be the conscience of the Nation, as it should be.

#### JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Mr. President, I also looked at the policing bill that Senator SCOTT announced today and Leader McConnell will proceed to next week. I am still reviewing the text. From the descriptions I have heard, the bill may be well-intentioned but falls far short on the reforms we need. It fails to meet this moment. That doesn't mean we can't come together and make it meet this moment.

We need more than a Rose Garden signing of an Executive order that has no authority and does nothing except look good. Millions of Americans in both parties are demanding real change. This moment doesn't call for a handful of studies and some grant programs; it calls for fundamental reforms to ensure our accountability and restore our trust. It requires a thoughtful debate, a real debate in which we have a real amendment process. Let Senators stand up and vote yes or no on amendments. Let the American people know where they stand. Let them take a position.

If our Republican leadership won't commit to such a real debate and such real votes or amendments—a real amendment process—they fail the American people at a critical time; they fail them in favor of partisan politics.

Each one of us has to cast votes on this floor. Some are very routine and easy to do, but so many are monumental. We have to speak to our conscience. We have to speak to our background. We have to speak to who we are. I will look at my background as a former prosecutor. I will look at my



background as one who has served as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I will look at my background as one who has listened to Republicans and Democrats alike in my State, but then I will call upon my conscience to vote for what is best.

Don't fail the American people by having something that feels good, that says nice things but doesn't make any change. If there were ever a time America needs changes—we have two crises. One, of course, is COVID-19, and we are not addressing that. The other is, once again, every American, of all races, has to look at racism in policing. We are better than that. Most of our police departments want to be better than that.

Let us stand up. Let the U.S. Senate be the conscience of the Nation. Again, I note we have been in the past. Wouldn't it be nice to be so in the present?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mrs. LOEFFLER assumed the Chair.)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the passage of the Great American Outdoors Act. The passage of this historic legislation marks a once-in-a-generation step by this body to restore and conserve our national parks, as well as our country's national heritage. It builds on an American tradition of conserving our natural wonders and shared public spaces. It reaffirms our commitment to preserve them for future generations.

It is also important to note that this is a jobs bill. According to a recent study, the Great American Outdoors Act will help create or support 100,000 jobs all over the country, including 10,000 in my home State of Virginia, at a time when millions of Americans are out of work.

Currently, the National Park Service has a deferred maintenance backlog of \$12 billion. A chronic lack of funding from Congress has forced the Park Service to defer maintenance on countless trails, buildings, and historic structures, as well as thousands of miles of roads and bridges. Today, over half of all Park Service assets are in desperate need of repair.

To address these needs, a little over 3 years ago, I approached my colleague and friend, Senator ROB PORTMAN, with an idea. What if we took unobligated Federal energy revenues and used them to address the maintenance backlogs at our national parks. So we came together, in a bipartisan partnership, and introduced the National Park Services

Legacy Act. A little over a year later, we combined our efforts with Senator ALEXANDER and Senator KING to introduce our Restore Our Parks Act. Earlier this year, this legislation was combined with Senator GARDNER and Senator MANCHIN's Land and Water Conservation Fund legislation to form the Great American Outdoors Act.

This legislation represents one of the largest investments in the infrastructure of our national parks in its over 100-year history. Over the next 5 years, the Great American Outdoors Act will fund more than half of all the deferred repairs and completely fund the Park Service's highest priority needs. As my friend from Maine, Senator KING, has noted, deferred maintenance is really simply a debt for future generations. With the passage of this bill today, we are one step closer to paying down that debt.

Few States in the country are as impacted by the Park Service's deferred maintenance backlog as the Commonwealth of Virginia. In the Commonwealth, we have a maintenance backlog of over \$1.1 billion. That is the third largest behind California and DC. I want to give a few examples of how this legislation will help preserve our historical heritage and create jobs in my State.

Here in the National Capital Region, the George Washington Memorial Parkway, which is managed by the National Park Service, has over \$700 million in deferred maintenance. As a matter of fact, anyone in this Chamber who travels on that road actually knows that we had a sinkhole appear in the parkway within the last year—an enormous safety threat, as well as an enormous inconvenience to anybody who travels on this important road. Our legislation would help rebuild this critical transportation route between Virginia, Washington, DC, and Maryland—reducing traffic and, again, creating jobs.

Further south on I-95, the Richmond National Battlefield Park has over \$5 million in deferred maintenance. The nearby Maggie L. Walker National Historic Site—this is the site actually of the first African-American-owned bank created by Maggie Walker, as well as the first bank owned by an African-American woman. I visited it last year, and it has maintenance needs approaching \$1 million. At the nearby Petersburg National Battlefield Park, the maintenance needs have grown to \$9 million over the years. This legislation will help support critical infrastructure needs of these parks, preserving these important pieces of our heritage while again supporting our local economies.

Let me take you a little farther west, out to one of the real gems of our National Park Service—probably one of the parks best known in Virginia around the country—and that is the Shenandoah National Park. It is one of the crown jewels of our Park Service. Again, the maintenance backlog there

in the Shenandoah sits at over \$90 million. Our legislation will put people to work on these overdue repairs, including to Skyline Drive and stretches of the Appalachian Trail, which are really at the heart of Virginia's outdoor tourism industry.

Let me take you a little farther down Skyline Drive, down farther in Southwest Virginia. As you head southwest, the Blue Ridge Parkway right here, which has accumulated over \$500 million in deferred maintenance—that is, as a matter of fact, over \$1 million of deferred maintenance for every mile of the Blue Ridge Parkway. The Great American Outdoors Act will, again, put Virginians to work on these repairs so visitors can continue to appreciate the beauty of Southwest Virginia and support the local economy.

Let me end my visual tour of Virginia going to the eastern part of the Commonwealth. This is one final example. Colonial National Historical Park, which is home to historic Jamestown and the Yorktown battlefield—some of our country's most significant sites from the birth of our Nation. At this park and along the Colonial Parkway, there are deferred maintenance needs totaling over \$430 million. With this legislation, the wait on many of these repairs is over. We are going to create jobs, make sure this important part of our history is around for years to come, and make sure we leave our kids and grandkids that sense of who we are as a nation.

Now, before I close, I want to touch on the other half of this legislation, which provides full mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the LWCF.

For decades, the LWCF has been the most important tool of the Federal Government that States have had to protect critical natural areas, water resources, and, again, cultural heritage. Virginia has received over \$368 million in LWCF funding, which has helped preserve and expand critical recreation areas within the Commonwealth.

For example, the American Battlefield Protection Program, which is funded through the LWCF, has been vital for communities across Virginia, providing them with technical assistance and funding to help them preserve their history and, again, attract tourists. LWCF has also allowed us to expand and preserve land within the George Washington and Jefferson National Forests and along the Appalachian Trail. These efforts support the health of unique wildlife habitats and provide new access for hunting, fishing, and other outdoor recreation.

Through this combination of the parks bill and the permanent funding for the LWCF, the Great American Outdoors Act ensures that we will continue to make these important investments in conservation in our parks for years to come.

In closing, I thank my colleagues, again, for supporting this historic legislation with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote and a piece of legislation

that is supported by the administration. My hope is that the House will move quickly on this. What better present to our Nation than to have this legislation signed into law, hopefully, by July 4.

As we all know, at a time of significant division in our country, the fact that this body was able to come together and pass this bill with over 70 votes gives me a little bit of hope. Again, I am proud of my colleagues for stepping up to restore our national parks and public lands, and as I mentioned at the outset, this legislation will create over 100,000 jobs, jobs that are extraordinarily needed at this critical moment when our economy has been shattered. So for current Americans and future Americans, job well done.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### JUSTICE ACT

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I woke up this morning, Wednesday morning, June 17, 2020, and for so many Americans, this is just another Wednesday morning. You wake up; you get ready for work—but not in South Carolina.

In South Carolina, this Wednesday, June 17, is the fifth anniversary of when a racist walked into Mother Emanuel Church, sat through a Bible study for an hour and listened to believers talk about their love of God. At the end of that Bible study, he pulled out a weapon and killed nine people. So for me and so many South Carolinians, this is a hard day.

I will tell you this: Standing on this floor, remembering the words of one of the victims' son, Daniel Simmons, Jr., 5 years ago on a Wednesday, 1 week later—I asked Daniel Simmons, Jr., whose father, Daniel Simmons, Sr., had been killed in an attempt to start another race war at the home of the Civil War: What should I say to the people who would be watching around the country?

He said what I could not believe. It was this: Please remind them of Romans 8:28—that all things work together for good for those who love God and are called according to His purpose.

I was standing at those doors on my cell phone. I could not believe the words he was speaking. In an act of true, unconditional love, he inspired me. He encouraged me. He taught me lessons of strength and courage and mercy our Nation needs to remember.

I came to the floor today to speak about my new bill, the JUSTICE Act, our Republican response to police re-

form. I was sitting in my office when the Senator from Illinois talked about the “token” legislation on this day, the day that we remember Mother Emanuel Church and the nine lost lives and my friend, the pastor of the church, Clementa Pinckney—the first person ever to call me a Senator, the pastor of that church, a Democrat pastor of that church said to me “My Senator,” in December of 2012—and reflect back on the fact that I have on my phone today the text for Clementa in which I said: Are you OK? He didn't answer because he was already dead.

To think that on this day, as we try to make sure that fewer people lose confidence in this Nation, to have the Senator from Illinois refer to this process, this bill, this opportunity to restore hope and confidence and trust to the American people, to African Americans, to communities of color—to call this a token process hurts my soul for my country, for our people.

To think that the concept of anti-lynching that is a part of this legislation would be considered a token piece of legislation because, perhaps, I am African American and the only one on this side of the aisle—I don't know what he meant, but I can tell you that, on this day, to hear those comments, again, hurts the soul.

To think about how, in the same year, 2015, Walter Scott, in my hometown of North Charleston, running away from the police, was shot five times in the back—I sponsored legislation then, and I don't remember a single person saying a single thing on that side of the aisle about helping to push forward more legislation on body cameras. But, today, this is a token piece of legislation. I think it is important that we stand up and be counted and make sure that we have more resources available for every officer to have a body camera because, as we saw in Georgia with Mr. Arbery, had it not been caught on video; in Walter Scott's case, had it not been caught on video; in George Floyd's case, had it not been caught on video, we might be in a different place.

On the other side, they are wanting to race-bait on tokenism, while this legislation would provide resources for body cameras, for anti-lynching, and for deescalation training. But, no, we can't concern ourselves with the families I sat with at the White House yesterday and in my office yesterday. Instead, we want to play politics because this is 2020, and we are far more concerned about winning elections than we are about having a serious conversation on reform in this country. No, we would rather have a conversation about tearing this country apart, making it a binary choice between law enforcement and communities of color instead of working for the American people, bringing the reforms to the table so that we have a chance to balance this Nation and direct her toward due north. No, that is too much to ask on June 17, 5 years later.

I started this conversation on body cameras in 2015, in the Walter Scott Notification Act in 2015. But, no, we want to have a political conversation. I reject that. I reject that.

I will tell you that I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle are serious about police reform. There are just some who are more interested in scoring political points than they actually are in getting a result.

It is not the majority of them. The majority of them have the same heart that we have for the American people. That is where we should be focusing our attention, not the color of my skin, not tokens. It is cool when you are out in the public. I get it all the time on Twitter. I am used to it. But on this day, my heart aches for my State. My heart aches for my uncle's church, which he attended for 50 years before he passed. So I am a little riled up.

I sit here quietly trying to pass good legislation that was based on the House bill because I knew that if I wanted a chance to get something done, we had to do it in a bipartisan fashion. I am not running for anything. I am not up for reelection. I am not trying to support someone for their victory. I am simply saying to the families I met with yesterday at the White House without a camera and in my office yesterday without a camera: I hear you. We see you. You are not simply sitting there silent. We are working on serious, tangible, measurable results.

Why is that not enough? Why can't we just disagree on the three or four items that we disagree upon? Why can't I say what I have been saying, which is that the House bill is, in fact, the blueprint for some progress? It goes too far for me in some areas, but, yes, I like the concept of more information. This is a good thing. The House does it; we do it. That is a good thing. I like the concept of more training. The House does it; we do it. I like the fact that we are looking for a way to ban choke holds. We do it by taking money from different departments; they do it in a different fashion. We are about 90 percent there.

But where do we go? Where do we go? People wonder why our country is so divided. It is because it is so easy to walk onto this floor and say “token” and send the same race-baiting message that we have heard for a very long time.

If you are a Democrat, hey, it is OK. That is not ever OK. It is not OK to say to our kids: You can't think what you want to think and be who you want to be. If you are not in line with one idea and the way they think, it is bad news. Then you are a sellout.

What message do you send the kids? I am going to be OK, but what message are we sending the kids throughout our country—that you can't be taught just to think; we have to teach you how to think. That is the kind of conclusion that is wrong. It is toxic. It is pushing our country toward an implosion that is avoidable.

That is why I started my legislative day today with remembering Mother Emanuel. It is why I read my Bible next—because I knew I needed a little extra strength. That is why I turned immediately to my first interview trying to talk about police reform because, as a guy who has been stopped 18 times in the years of the 2000s, I take it seriously. Being stopped seven times in a single year, being stopped this year, being stopped last November, being stopped coming into the Senate with my pin on—sure, I get it. But I don't point fingers at the other side, saying that they are just not serious about the issue. It is just not what we should do.

I assume that everybody should be serious about the issue, but I have to tell you, it is with a heavy heart—it is with a heavy heart that I believe that, had we had more money for body cameras, we would be in a different position today than we were in 2015. But I didn't have anybody who wanted to have this conversation or, at least, they didn't have this conversation.

I believe there are good people of good intent on the other side of the aisle. I think there are people of good intent on our side of the aisle. I think the fact is that most Americans are tired of Republicans and Democrats talking about Republicans and Democrats. I think most Americans are tired of our talking about election outcomes and polls. "What about me?" is what they are saying.

I am suggesting that this bill, the JUSTICE Act, is a serious nationwide effort tackling the issues of police reform, accountability, and transparency. It is grounded in bipartisan principles because I believe that the other side has some stuff we have to hear and that our side has some stuff they need to hear. If we do that, we will have the votes to have a real debate next week on this bill, but if we don't do that, we will just talk about scoring political points, and you will go on MSNBC or CNN, and we will go on FOX, and everybody will have their chatter, and more people in the communities of color will have less confidence in the institutions of power and authority in this Nation because we missed the moment. We missed it 5 years ago. We don't have to miss it now.

As you know, I am not really into theatrics. I don't run toward microphones. I have had a lot of them these last 7 days. I don't talk a lot in conference because, why say what other people are saying? They have probably said it better. I don't demonize the other side because I know that in order to get anything done in this conference, on this committee, in this Senate, you have to have 60 votes. Plus, if you have a grievance with your brother, talk to them. Talk to them. I have tried to do that.

As I am sure I am running out of time, let me just say that the families I sat down with yesterday—they don't think working on body cameras is a

token experience. They don't think sitting down with the President of the United States, with tears filling their eyes, running down their cheeks, talking about their lost loved ones is a token experience. The law enforcement officers in that meeting with those families do not believe that having a serious conversation about police reform is a token experience. They don't believe that corresponders for the one man who was in the room, whose son was having a mental episode, who was shot on the scene—he doesn't think this was a token experience.

Shame on us. Shame on us if we are unwilling to have a serious conversation about a serious issue that, in my opinion, is a greater threat to this Nation than perhaps anything we have seen. We have never solved it because we are all having political points. That is wrong. It is just not right.

Let me say to all of my colleagues, Senator LANKFORD, Senators CAPITO, SASSE, LINDSEY, BARRASSO, and ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you for giving a voice to a serious issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, first, I would like to associate my remarks 100 percent with everything Senator SCOTT just said. Somehow I am supposed to speak after he just said it.

The frustration that I have had over the past couple of days as we have worked very hard in pulling the legislation together is we have talked to people all over. I have talked to people of all backgrounds all over Oklahoma. I have talked to members of the community. I have talked to law enforcement. I have talked to leadership in law enforcement. We have worked to build a coalition of ideas, things that would pass, answering the question that TIM SCOTT started with: Could we pull together a piece of legislation that would actually help—not to just pass something so we can walk away, pat each other on the back and say "We passed something," knowing quietly that it really isn't going to make any difference? Is there something we could do that would actually make a difference?

Over the weeks we have worked to identify what could pass, what could make a difference, what answers the questions everyone is asking. We didn't look at whether it was a Republican or Democratic idea. We just asked the question, what would make the difference, because I don't believe equal justice under the law is owned by a party. It has been fascinating to me, the questions I have had over the past couple of days as members of the media would quietly pull me aside and say: Hey, are Republicans going to be able to pass a bill on race? Quietly, they are asking the question: We know all those Republicans are racist, so are you going to be able to pull something off? That is really what they are saying in the background. Over and over again, I heard it through the media and have

seen it put out there: You know those Republicans are all racist. I don't think they are going to be able to pass something dealing with race.

As this dividing message continues to go out, we continue to do our work because we also believe in equal justice under the law. As a friend of mine said to me a couple of weeks ago, we also believe we should be able to work toward a more perfect Union.

For me, it is not only a practical issue, not only a family issue; it is not only a friendship issue; it is not only a basic freedom and liberty issue; it is not just a constitutional issue. For me, it is also a Biblical issue. You can go back as many pages as you want to in Scripture and work your way from beginning to end, and you are going to find some very consistent themes. Throughout the book of Deuteronomy, there is a statement about how God's affection is "for equal weights and measures." His first challenge to government when literally the Jews were establishing their first government, God spoke to them, saying, make sure there are equal weights and measures. It is a simple way of saying, whether you are rich or poor, whether you are a foreigner, whether you are a member, whether you are in or out, everyone is to be treated the same, equal weights, equal measures. Find that passage over and over and over again through the Old Testament. Read it all the way to the Book of the Revelation at the end.

At the Book of Revelation at the end, there is a gathering around the throne that is pictured. At the very end, there is the gathering of the Kingdom of God. As they gather around the throne, it is described as every tribe, every nation, every language, every people, all gathered.

For me, this is a Biblical issue as well as being a personal issue, but for us as a nation, it is a legal issue. It is about where we find inconsistencies in the application of the law, we are to correct it, and we do what we can to make it right.

This bill is designed with a simple statement in mind. How can we provide accountability, transparency, and training in law enforcement so that the good cops shine and those who are bad apples in the mix, the light shines on them.

That is all we are asking. We want to see things change. People in my towns across my State want to see things change and want to know that this is not just a vote that is a partisan vote; it is a vote to actually get something solved.

It wasn't that long ago that this body was gathering and voted unanimously on an almost \$3 trillion bill dealing with a major problem in America, COVID-19. Why don't we get together again, hash out the issues, and unanimously come to some decisions again on a major problem in America, injustice?

We can't pass something that bans racism. I wish we could. We would have

all taken that vote. We can't ban racism. That is passed on through families and individuals. Children are not born racist. They are raised racist. Families have to make a decision about what they are going to do in their family. The national conversation about race doesn't happen in this room. The national conversation on race happens in kitchens and dining rooms.

We can do something about justice. There are simple things we tried to gather, a set of ideas that aren't partisan. They are ideas and solutions that have come from all over the place, some Democratic and some Republican, and we pulled these things together, and we are asking a simple question: Will our Democratic Members take a vote with us next week to move to this bill to amend it, debate it, talk about it, have a real dialogue, and pass something that we think will work? Will this bill look exactly like this? It probably will look a lot like this because there are aspects of this that look like this in the House right now. Will there be additional ideas? Probably. Why don't we debate it and talk about it? Why don't we both open it up and discuss it and why don't we actually try to solve it?

There are things such as, if there is bodily injury or death in police custody, that all of that information has to come in to the FBI so we can disseminate it and get transparency in the country. In fact, 40 percent of the departments report that, but a lot of them do not.

There are a lot of places that do no-knock warrants. We don't have information about that. We know it is happening all over the country, and there is some conversation about maybe we should end part of it or keep part of it. What would that look like? We don't have the information gathered. Why don't we get information on no-knock warrants so that we can make an informed decision and then act on it?

Why don't we deal with some basic problems that are out there that we have seen several times in some of the worst moments? Something happens, and law enforcement is not wearing a body camera, and it is one opinion against another opinion. Why don't we get more body cameras in the streets, and why don't we make sure those body cameras are actually turned on all the time? There is new technology in body cameras so that they automatically turn on when there is a call. Law enforcement doesn't have to worry about, "I forgot to turn it on." It turns itself on. Why don't we incentivize it to encourage new body cameras with automatic features to turn it on so we always have footage?

Why don't we hold people to account if there is a false police report that is filed? In several cases of late, when the incident was over, a written police report was filed. Later, cell phone video came out that was completely different from the original police report. Well, that is a false report. Why don't we hold that bad apple to account?

Why don't we end choke holds? Most departments already have. Why don't we just end it nationwide? Why don't we say to departments: If you want to get a Federal grant for any law enforcement purpose, you can't get that or you get a reduced amount or you get a big deduction unless your department has already banned choke holds. Basically, we lay the marker out there and say: We expect you to take action on this.

Why don't we deal with the issues that are before us that people are asking questions about, and where we lack information, let's go get it.

It was several years ago that Senator PETERS, on the Democratic side, and Senator CORNYN, on the Republican side, put out a proposal to have a Commission study these issues and more, to gather information and make recommendations and to start passing legislation in a unified way. It passed in the Senate unanimously and died in the House. Let's bring that legislation back up.

We tried to do some work in the Senate to head this off. Let's do it again and see what we can actually do. Where we find departments that are recruiting officers and the department doesn't match the ethnicity of their community, why don't we provide grants for that community and that police department to be able to have a Black recruiter recruit more Black officers and to help them financially in the earliest days through the police academy to make sure that department profile matches that community?

One of the great gains of the last 30 years has been community policing, allowing officers to be able to get out of their car and meet their community and to engage so communities are policing together. Why don't we do that?

I did a ride-along with an officer several years ago, and I will never forget it. As we were riding through his community and his neighborhood where he always patrolled, we drove by an elderly lady as sweet as she could be sitting on her front porch. As we drove by I asked: Does she sit out there every day?

The police officer laughed and said: Yep, she sits out there every day.

I asked: Have you ever stopped to meet her?

He hesitated for a long time, and he said: No, I never have.

Community policing does make a difference. When you get a chance to meet the people in the community, get to know them, and share the responsibility together for actually working to solve problems that we face.

We are laying down a set of ideas that we feel will make a difference, not just make a message. Other people have other ideas. Bring them. Let's open it up.

Let's not have heated debate. Let's have debate that solves the problems so that at the end of this, we know what we are solving. We solve it, and then we keep going.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, for one, I would like to say something about Senator SCOTT. I know how hard it is to work on this, and it has not been an easy enterprise for Tim. He is a conservative Republican, who happens to be African-American, and he has decided to take the lead on something that is very important to the country.

He has had experiences that I don't have. He has been stopped multiple times on Capitol Hill. I have never been stopped. One year, he was stopped seven times for lane changes. The point is that Tim believes—and every African-American male I have talked to in the last couple of weeks is told early on, if you are stopped by the cops, watch what you do; keep your hands on the wheel and don't go toward the dash because that could end badly. I don't know how that happened, but it is real. For us not to realize that would be a huge mistake.

Let me be on record as saying I understand that if you are an African-American male, your experience with the police is different than mine. It is unacceptable, and it needs to stop.

So how do you stop it? You bring about change. So what kind of change are we looking for? Our Democratic friends have a list of changes. I think it is Justice in Policing. The House is marking it up. Here is what I would say to my Democratic colleagues: Stop lecturing me. You had 8 years under President Obama to do the things in the Justice in Policing Act, and 90 percent of it you never brought up. I am not saying we are blameless, but there has not been this sense of urgency to deal with these problems institutionally like there is today. Why? Because of Mr. Floyd and a few other things all happening together.

Tim said in 2016 we had our chance. These episodes come and they go. The question for the country is, Will anything ever change? The only way it is going to change is to find common ground. So the proposal Senator SCOTT has collected, along with other colleagues, has bipartisan support, but if it is not enough, I am willing to listen regarding doing more.

Senator SASSE was with me yesterday. We had a 5-hour hearing, and I learned a lot. I learned that a police department looking like the community is important, Senator LANKFORD, but, more importantly, is that you live where you police.

I asked a gentleman from New Jersey: What is more important, race or community attachment? He said: Community attachment. You are less likely to hurt somebody in a community you feel a part of.

Now, having said that, we need more African-American police personnel. We need more women. Apparently, women do their jobs a lot better than men. I haven't heard one person come forward and say: I had a bad experience with a

policewoman. More women would be helpful. But the main thing is, we need people from the community being in charge of policing that community with a system that is more accountable.

So CORY BOOKER and I have worked together on a lot of things—great guy. TIM and CORY are good friends, and I admire the heck out of TIM SCOTT. I am not going to take any more time. He is one of the most decent people I have ever met, and we are lucky to have him in South Carolina and the country is lucky.

The bottom line, as CORY said, there are two issues that have to be addressed or everything else doesn't matter—242 and qualified immunity. I wrote them down. For those who are not conversant in 242 or qualified immunity, there is nothing wrong with you. This is a very archaic area of the law. Qualified immunity is a judicial doctrine that has developed over time that relates to the 1983 civil rights statute that allows people to sue governmental entities for abuse of force, for excessive force.

There is nothing in the statute about an objective standard where the reasonably prudent police officer in the same circumstances acted accordingly. There is nothing about good faith.

Justice Thomas is a pretty conservative guy. He wanted to revisit qualified immunity. I don't know how he would substantively come out on the issue, but in his dissent denying certiorari of the concept, he explains how this judicial concept has exploded beyond every attachment of common law analysis. This is Clarence Thomas. If you presented to me qualified immunity in its current form as a legislative proposal, I would vote hell, no. Police officers need not worry about losing their house or being sued if they act in good faith in performing duties that are hard on any good day, but when police departments time and again fail to do the things necessary to instill good policing, I think they should be subject and accountable like any other business. There is common ground here.

Not one Democrat has suggested to me to make the individual officer civilly liable under 242, but I had Democrats suggest to me that the standard has become almost absolute immunity.

The Presiding Officer has run all kinds of businesses. Being in the policing business is not your normal business. There needs to be a filter when it comes to lawsuits. It can't be about outcome. But it is now time, in my view, to look at the development of the qualified immunity doctrine as it relates to the 1983 underlying statute and see if we could make it better, not gut it.

To my Democratic friends, if you want to eliminate qualified immunity, it will be a very short conversation. If you want to reform it so that municipalities and agencies and organizations running police departments will have some protection but not absolute im-

munity, let's talk. Maybe we can get there if it is that important. Let's at least try. That is what the legislative process is all about.

Section 242 allows the Federal Government to bring charges against an individual for denying another American their constitutional rights. This is about policing but not exclusive to policing.

The Presiding Officer is from Georgia. I am from South Carolina. There was a time in the South where juries would nullify all the evidence in front of them because the victim was a Black man and the perpetrator was White. A mountain of evidence could be presented, and there would be an acquittal in like 15 minutes. So we came up with a concept to allow the Federal Government to intervene in cases like that and hold somebody liable for violating the constitutional rights of another American under law Federal law.

The standard to prosecute is "willful." You have to prove that the police officer willfully understood the constitutional right and violated it. My friends on the other side want to lower the standard to "reckless." What I would say is, this is not 1965. The police officer involved in Mr. Floyd's death is going to be prosecuted. So while it is important to talk about section 242, most States where these events have occurred have acted responsibly. We don't need the Federal Government sitting in judgment of every cop in the country. What we do need is a system of accountability. I will talk to you about 242, but I think that is not the issue.

What is the issue? It is that police departments that are immune from liability when they engage in abusive conduct over and over are unlikely to change until that changes. You can throw all the money you want to at training and improving best practices, and they will gladly accept your money. If they don't do it right, they don't get the money. Add one thing to the mix. By the way, if you shoot a dog and you wind up killing a kid—your police officer shouldn't have shot the dog anyway in a fashion to kill the kid who was right by the dog—you are going to wind up having your ass in court. That will change things.

I have been a lawyer, and I know how people feel about this. If you are exposed, in terms of your conduct being subject to a review by a court and a jury, you are all of a sudden going to think differently.

Don't misconstrue what I am saying. I am not for abolishing qualified immunity; I am for revisiting the concept because I think it has grown too much from judicially created fiat. It is time for the legislative body—for us to speak as to what we would like to have happen to the statute that we create that now has a component to it that was never envisioned when it was originally passed. That is what Clarence Thomas is telling us as a nation we need to do.

To my friends on the other side, if it is about qualified immunity, let's talk. If it is about 242, let's talk. If it is about keeping this issue alive, don't waste my time. We have all had plenty of time around here to do better. Now we have a chance to actually do some good. The only way we are going to do some good is talk. The only way you get a law passed is to engage in debate. If you don't want to debate the topic, if you don't want to have amendments about the topic, that tells me all I need to know about where you are coming from.

I yield to the Senator from Nebraska. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I want to start by saying thank you to my friend from South Carolina—LINDSEY GRAHAM, chairman of the Judiciary Committee spoke, but I mean my desk mate, Senator SCOTT from South Carolina—not only for his leadership and hard work and the hard work of Jennifer and the rest of that their team. Over the course of the last 2 weeks, they have been working around the clock to lead our six-person working group on this project.

I want to thank Tim, not just for his leadership, but for his speech 30 minutes ago and for his spirit. That speech is a speech that needs to be watched by every American.

I sincerely hope that the 100 people in this room will come together and try to get an outcome and not just maintain a political issue as has happened so often around here. I think if we had the process that was the custom in the Senate until a few decades ago of committees happening in the morning and the Senate convening for most of the afternoon—if this room were actually full when TIM SCOTT delivered his speech, it would be real tough for people to be talking about not voting on the motion to proceed next week and getting on this piece of legislation where we could then debate it and argue about it and fight about technical pieces here and there and figure out how we make it better. We would be on a piece of legislation, and we would be trying to get an outcome. I sincerely hope that is true. I sincerely hope people listen to TIM SCOTT's speech from today.

George Floyd's murder, obviously, shocked the nation. It shocked us in two ways. It shocked us, on the one hand, because we saw a man being murdered for 8 minutes and 46 seconds, and we saw three other police officers stand by while he was murdered. But it also shocked us because it reminded us, yet again, that America's struggle for equal justice under the law is far, far from over.

The American creed is a beautiful thing. The American creed celebrates the dignity, the inherent self-worth, the fact that we believe, as so many of our Founders believed, that people were created *Imago Dei*—created in the image of God as image bearers. That

dignity is male and female, Black and White. Every man, woman, and child in this country is created with inherent dignity. They are beautiful, and that creed is beautiful. That proposition that all men are created equal should inspire every generation of Americans. We aren't doing a very good job right now of passing on the glories of that creed to the next generation. It is a beautiful and profound creed, but throughout our history, our failures to live up to that creed have been ugly over and over again.

George Floyd's murder was horrific for that man and for his family and for everyone in his communities—Minneapolis, Houston, and other places where that man had made a mark. But it was also horrific because it was yet another reminder of all the ways that we fail to live up to our creed. The creed is beautiful, and our execution has so often been ugly.

When communities of color have lost faith in law enforcement, we aren't living up to that creed. When an American tells you that he fears being pulled over for driving while Black, we need a lot more conversations in a lot more communities so people know this experience.

Again, Senator SCOTT is one of my closest friends in this body. The experiences he has had with law enforcement in South Carolina are different from the ones I have had with law enforcement in Nebraska. The experiences he has on Capitol Hill with law enforcement have been different from the experiences I have had on Capitol Hill. No one should be wearing skin pigment or racial heritage as something that changes our experience of law enforcement, yet it is regularly the case. That is ugly. The creed is beautiful.

Our attempts to become and to be a more perfect Union and to live up to the glories of that creed are an important part of our shared project together. At the risk of sounding too theological, east of Eden, sin is always ugly, and that includes America's original sin. That tells us that we have work to do together.

We have work to do as 330 million Americans, but we have work to do as 100 Senators. What that should mean is that next week we are going to be in this body trying to live up to that creed and to do more.

There is a lot of technical stuff inside this bill. As Senator SCOTT said, 70 percent of what is in this bill is pretty darn noncontroversial, largely because it is lifted and summarizing many pieces that are also in the House of Representatives' Democrat bill.

The JUSTICE Act puts forward a number of commonsense reforms that seek to force more accountability. This has been stated on the floor many times today, but I want to say it again: When police use lethal force, there is a voluntary opportunity today for them to report that to the FBI. We want to make that mandatory. We want all that data to be captured and to be

passed along so there is a lot more transparency on all lethal uses of force.

The commonsense reforms include increasing police resources. There is a lot of training that needs to be done better across this country. There are a lot of practices in local law enforcement—when you look at the 15,000, 16,000, whatever the current number is of local entities that have the capability and capacity to have law enforcement authorities, those policing powers, there is a lot of diversity in their practices. Some of those practices are improving but are still bad. Senator SCOTT and our legislation want to try to use the Federal grant-making powers to squeeze out some of those bad practices.

We want to see trust rebuilt between this Nation's communities and the police. We reject the false binary that you have to make a choice between being on the side of communities of color or being on the side of law enforcement. No, we don't want that to be the choice. We want the choice to be law enforcement to get better and communities of color to have more trust. We want to see more collaboration. We want to see more progress. Frankly, that is what the vast majority of individual police and that is what the vast majority of police departments want.

The overwhelming majority of Americans—Republican and Democrat, women and men, Black and White—the overwhelming majority of Americans want us to build more trust. We can do that in this body next week.

We want to strive toward equal protection under the law. That starts with trying to narrow the differences and figuring out what we can do to move forward together. That is what this bill does. This bill is an architectural frame to do a bunch of good things that are pretty darn noncontroversial and to do a bunch of things that we can build on in a debate and amendment process.

We should be passing something 100 to 0. There will be debate. There will be amendment votes underneath that will be contentious, but we should ultimately be getting onto a piece of legislation to start the process 100 to 0, and at the back end we should be passing something 100 to 0 even though, in the middle, there should be a bunch of amendments where people argue about the best way that we do the particulars.

There is no reason we shouldn't be moving forward. We can get this done. We can take another step to make America's beautiful creed a reality for every single one of God's children. That is what we should do, and we should do it without delay.

I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I am pleased to be here with my fellow Senator from Nebraska and the other Members of the small team that was

really blessed to be asked to join Senator SCOTT as he led us to where we are today, which is introducing the JUSTICE Act.

I am thinking about where the great talents lie in the Senate. One of the things we all know all of us do well is talk. We know how to talk. Sometimes we talk too much. Senator SCOTT doesn't talk that much. He even said that about himself. I can tell you the skill that he has that a lot of us need more of. Always, when I am asked by school children "What is the best skill to have?" I say it is the ability to listen. He has listened for years and years. He has not just lived this; he has listened. He said, just yesterday, he was with the family of one of the victims, and it was a very moving day for him.

I am here today to rise with my colleagues in support of the JUSTICE Act. I join the overwhelming majority of Americans and West Virginians who, in sadness and frustration and sorrow, witnessed the horrifying video of the murder of George Floyd by the Minneapolis Police Department. It was absolutely unacceptable.

The vast majority of our law enforcement officers here and around the country are just like us. They want to have a great and peaceful nation. They want to have great and peaceful communities. They want their families to feel safe in their homes and out in the streets of their communities just as we do. A lot of them take their oath seriously and do their best to protect our communities.

It is not enough to say that the death of George Floyd was a terrible, isolated tragedy because we know many of these have preceded this date. I have said it is almost like popping a balloon and revealing all of this unrest underneath, all the questions and sorrow that have been festering.

Here we are today. I think the great majority of us want to put all this energy and frustration into action. We want to have something substantive so we can tell the American people: We listened. We heard. We feel this. And we want to find solutions.

We have to recognize that every time force is used inappropriately by law enforcement, our justice system has eroded. We have to understand our history, wherein Black Americans have been too frequently denied their basic rights. It is our job to make sure that Americans, regardless of race, can feel that law enforcement is there to protect them and their families and that they trust that. The trust factor is where the erosion has been most remarkably in view of all of us—the lack of trust.

It is our job to hear these voices and to act. In my opinion, it doesn't mean defunding the police; it means improving the police and improving equal protections so that everybody has basic protections and we are all equal in the eyes of justice and the law.

We have seen the looting. We have seen officers who have lost their lives.



We have seen an underbelly to our country that has been difficult to watch. Yet what we have seen, too, is an outcry of the American citizens peacefully protesting what they see as inequities in their lives. When I look in the crowd—I was right there in Washington last week when a crowd of about 150 protesters walked by me very peacefully with signs and chanting in solidarity. Most of the people in that group were probably under 30 years old. There were a lot of Black faces, a lot of White faces, men and women, young people who felt that lack of trust. We look at how people have exercised their First Amendment rights. It is a beautiful thing to see. Unfortunately, it has been eroded by some of the destructive things that have come along with it, but at the base of it, we are hearing the same things in our States every day.

While we want to know that our Declaration of Independence has lived up to—and that the 14th amendment, which guarantees that no government, including State and local governments, can deny basic constitutional rights, we haven't quite lived up to all of that.

A century passed before we passed major civil rights legislation in 1964. One of the sources of great pride for me is that my father was one of the leading Republicans in the House of Representatives representing West Virginia in 1964 who helped make sure that passed. In my office, I actually have a pen that was used in signing that and a picture of my dad at the White House when it was signed.

Our job is not done. When I hear the voices of mothers who say that they are fearful their son might not survive a simple traffic stop or they must have certain behaviors—as Senator SASSE said, it is so different from what he learned growing up as a young man about how to interact with police officers in that situation. We can't have those anguished cries and that double system anymore. That is what this bill is about.

I am proud to be with Senator SCOTT introducing the JUSTICE Act. It has been interesting to watch him and all of us listen to the different segments of our society who have talked to us—friends, neighbors, police, members of communities of color, our religious communities, our news commentators. I did six interviews today on the TV about this. Every single one of them asked me one fundamental question, and I wish some of my friends on the other side of the aisle would be here. They asked: You don't have a very good history in this body of having Republicans and Democrats joining together to get something done. How do you think you can do this now? I said: Well, today we did. We did the Great American Outdoors Act. Several months ago we did the CARES Act. We can do it. Where there is a will, we can do it.

If we don't do it, we are failing so many people. We are failing ourselves. We are failing our country, our com-

munities, failing our law enforcement communities. I would say that we need to begin this job of a difficult conversation and make sure that we get this bill onto the Senate floor and debate it in front of the general public.

When we start debating things on the Senate floor in front of the general public, do you know what happens? The same thing that happened during the impeachment trial. I know all of us were getting all kinds of input from people all around. People are watching it. They are seeing what is actually going on. That is what we need. If we want to have discussions on qualified immunity, if we want to ban choke holds, which I want to do and our bill does, essentially, but if you want something more definitively, yes, I am all for that. Let's have the discussion and talk about it in front of the American people.

I believe that law enforcement has a lot of great people who work in and around law enforcement. They need the equipment. They need the cameras. They need to have the realtime evidence—the realtime evidence of wrongdoing and evidence of doing it right. It is a protective device. Everybody should have the availability of that in law enforcement.

We also require that law enforcement agencies retain disciplinary records on officers and make sure that they check an officer's record from other agencies before making a hiring decision. I kind of thought that was going on anyway. I sort of did. We need to make sure and make clear that is what we absolutely want to do.

The bill incentivizes State and local police agencies to ban choke holds. As I mentioned earlier, I am for even more definitive language on that.

It also provides training in all kinds of areas—deescalation or if an officer is in a situation where another officer is using overwhelming force improperly, that officer is trained on how to interdict that situation. We saw that happen in Minneapolis. Sadly, the officers did not, but maybe they didn't know how to do it, when to do it, what form it should take. Let's explore that.

To keep our communities safe, we need our police officers. We need trust in our law enforcement. There should be no conflict between a pro-civil rights bill and a pro-law enforcement bill. They should be able to be joined together. This supports our police officers while bringing about positive change that will guarantee equal protection to all of our citizens. The police reform bill will make a real difference in advancing our constitutional ideals and in making our communities safer.

I am proud to stand with Senator SCOTT, but I want to stand with the entire body to talk about the ways to make this bill even better, to take the 70 percent of this bill that we have shared ideals on and shared ideas and put those into action and to not dither here, to not score political points, and to say to the American people: These

are tough decisions, and we are going to make them. We are going to have this where you can see it, right here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

So thank you very much. I am proud to be with my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF JUSTIN REED WALKER

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, we are in the middle of a pandemic. The President of the United States doesn't act like it, but Americans are still dying by the hundreds—several hundred almost every day.

We are in the middle of an economic crisis. Again, the President of the United States doesn't act like it. He crows about the unemployment numbers when they are the worst since World War II.

And we are in the middle of a crisis of conscience. Millions of Americans have taken to the streets to protest the murders of Black and Brown Americans by the people supposed to protect them.

With all of these challenges, the President of the United States is failing. The Senate should be stepping in right now to fill that leadership void, to get more help to families and to communities that are going bankrupt, to protect workers—to use every tool we have to force the administration to get some kind of test trace isolate regime in place to truly stop the spread of the coronavirus. We should be listening to the protestors demanding justice in communities all across the country, large and small.

They remind us this pandemic isn't a separate issue from racial justice—it is all connected. It is not a coincidence that President Trump stopped even pretending to try to fight the coronavirus once he realized it was disproportionately Black and Brown Americans dying, not very often one of his rich friends.

In the Senate, we have plans to get help and protections to workers; we have plans to fund a scale-up of testing that gets us closer to the level we need; we have plans to work to hold police accountable; we have begun to tackle the systemic racism in our justice system.

Look at it this way: The last time I was on an airplane was in mid-March. I live close enough—6-hour drive between Cleveland and Washington. In mid-March, there were about 90 coronavirus cases diagnosed in the United States—halfway around the world from where the Presiding Officer likes to emphasize it came from, Wuhan. About 900 miles from Wuhan is the capital of South Korea—Seoul. In South Korea, around that same time, there were 90 cases. So South Korea had 90 diagnosed cases; the United States had about 90 diagnosed cases.

Since that date in March, fewer than 300 Koreans have died of the coronavirus; over 110,000 Americans have died of the coronavirus.



In Korea, their unemployment rate now is under 4 percent; our unemployment rate is somewhere between three and four times that.

That is clearly the incompetence—this is not a partisan statement. I have watched my Republican Governor of Ohio, who has done a good job, teamed up with Dr. Amy Acton, the health director, in combating this virus early, while the President of the United States was still blaming the virus on—saying it was a hoax or not real or whatever he said, and then his inept leadership didn't scale up testing, didn't have any national program to provide protective equipment to our people.

So we have seen the bungled leadership out of the White House—110,000 Americans passed away, an unemployment rate higher than at any time in my lifetime—but we are not doing anything about that here in this body. Why? Because Leader McConnell doesn't want to do anything about it, for whatever reason. Instead of rising to meet the crisis of the pandemic or unemployment or the protests on our streets, Senator McConnell wants to create a new crisis by confirming more extreme judges that are trying to take away America's healthcare.

The challenges we are facing as a country are bad enough. Imagine if Leader McConnell and President Trump get their way—their handpicked judges throw tens of millions of Americans off of their health insurance in the middle of a pandemic. That sounds farfetched? Well, no, it isn't.

In the middle of a pandemic, this President continues his lawsuit to try to overturn the Affordable Care Act, even though the voters have ratified it through a number of elections in 2012 and 2014 and 2016 and 2018. It still stands, but the President of the United States is trying to take away people's healthcare. They are trying to sneak ACA repeal through the courts since they couldn't do it in Congress.

While the rest of the country is distracted just trying to keep their families safe, judges are deciding the fate of America's health coverage right now.

The nomination we are considering this week—right now on the floor—of Judge Walker is part of that effort. Judge Walker has served in the Western District of Kentucky for just 6 months.

What makes him qualified for the DC Circuit? It is not the 6 months he served in Kentucky. In fact, the bar association in Kentucky said he wasn't qualified for that job. He has only had it for 6 months. What makes him qualified?

Just go down the hall. I am sure you could have seen many, many times Judge Walker when he was Law Clerk Walker or Young Man Walker or Grandson of Contributor Walker going in and out of Senator McConnell's office. He is a protege of McConnell's. He thinks the way McConnell thinks; he acts the way McConnell acts; and that is what it is all about.

Before his nomination to the district court, Walker praised then-Judge Kavanaugh for providing a roadmap the Supreme Court could use to strike down the ACA. So it isn't just that Judge Walker is a young, unqualified, extremist, far-right protege of the majority leader. It is not just that. I mean, talk about the swamp. That is what that is.

What it is all about is putting another vote in a key place to overturn the Affordable Care Act. He is calling upholding the ACA indefensible and catastrophic.

I don't know how, in the middle of a pandemic, you look at the American landscape, you see how many people have been sick—millions of Americans have been sick—110,000 Americans have died, hundreds more every day, and you think one of the most important things you can do is strip millions of Americans of their healthcare.

He has continued his attacks on American healthcare protections since he joined the Federal bench. In March 2020, at his formal swearing-in ceremony as district judge, Judge Walker said the worst words he heard while clerking for Justice Kennedy on the Supreme Court were the Chief Justice's rationale for upholding the ACA. The worst words he heard from the man for whom he was working were his words to uphold the ACA, the Affordable Care Act.

Now, what I forgot to mention was that when Judge Walker said that at his swearing-in ceremony, there were a couple of important visitors there.

Although the Senate should have been in session and finished our work on the first round of the coronavirus, Senator McConnell—his office is down the hall. As we know, Senator McConnell decided to adjourn the Senate and go back to Kentucky for this swearing-in. Judge Kavanaugh, another protege, if you will, of Senator McConnell's was there too.

So don't forget, Senator McConnell is on the ballot this year. Senator McConnell faces an opponent who is running neck and neck with him. It is a very Republican State, but Senator McConnell is not a particularly well-liked figure in his State, as we have seen through many years.

So Senator McConnell didn't do his job here. It is not just he didn't do his job. He stopped us from doing our jobs so he could fly back, be with Supreme Court Justice Kavanaugh, to remind the voters in Kentucky that he is the strong man who got Judge Kavanaugh on the Supreme Court and then to celebrate the swearing-in of just another young judge to a Federal district court. That is where Senator McConnell's priorities are.

We know Judge Walker is the latest in a long line of judges pushed by President Trump, rammed through by Leader McConnell, as his minions, shills, obedient junior Senators or sheep—you choose the noun for your colleagues—all vote yes so you could

put another member on another Federal court who is trying to take away Americans' healthcare.

Chad Readler, from my State, who is now serving on the Sixth Circuit, led the Trump administration's efforts to dismantle the entire Affordable Care Act, and David Porter, who holds a Pennsylvania seat on the Third Circuit, wrote that the ACA "violates the Framers' constitutional design."

What kind of law training do you have, and what kind of upbringing do you have—what kind of way do you think?—that you would think that providing healthcare to citizens is a violation of the Framers' constitutional design? Who thinks that way? On and on it goes.

The American people want to keep their healthcare. They have made that clear. They especially want to keep that healthcare in the middle of, for gosh sakes, a pandemic. Leader McConnell needs to stop trying to take it away through the courts and start letting us actually get to work to make people healthier.

Let's get to work to save lives from the coronavirus. Let's get to work to save lives from police violence. Let's get to work to save lives from all of the inequities in our healthcare system. Let's get to work to put money in people's pockets, help them pay the bills and stay in their homes, and help State and local governments from laying off thousands and thousands of workers.

Leader McConnell, let us do our job, the job for which we were elected.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—S. RES. 596  
AND S. 3798

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about the death of democracy, and I am here today to talk about how we can stand with those who are fighting to preserve it.

In the United States, the death of democracy might seem like a distant and unfamiliar thing. We study examples in the history books. We read of nations and peoples who are forced, through no choice of their own, to surrender their basic liberties. We remind ourselves of the need always to stay vigilant, to stay aware, but we are seeing today the death of democracy unfold in realtime, right before our eyes, in the city of Hong Kong.

A diverse and global city, rich in culture and arts and commerce and people, Hong Kong is an outpost of liberty. For decades, under a special set of laws and protections, it has stood as a haven of liberty—a beacon, a light—but I fear that light is fast dimming, nearly overcome by darkness and by tyranny.

This body, along with all free peoples, has a special responsibility to take a stand for the freedom-loving people of Hong Kong. We must take a stand to ensure that the light of Hong Kong does not go out forever. We must take a stand to ensure that this outpost of liberty lives on. We must take

a stand so that the flame of freedom is not extinguished forever by the Chinese Communist Party.

On May 28, Beijing announced that it would adopt legislation that will essentially jettison the basic law under which Hong Kong has been governed for decades. It is legislation that will trample upon Beijing's own treaty commitments in the 1984 Sino-British Treaty, legislation—they call it legislation, but, of course, what it really is is just fiat, fiat by the Chinese Communist Party in Beijing—that will strip Hong Kong of its basic liberties, strip Hongkongers of the right to freedom of speech, strip Hongkongers of the right to peacefully assemble, strip Hongkongers of their rights to redress in fair and open courts with some process of law.

Beijing wants to deny the people of Hong Kong all of these things because liberty is a threat to the authoritarian Communist regime in Beijing. Oh, it fears the people. It fears the will of the people, and it fears the liberty of the people. It is trying to destroy the last outpost of liberty in its nation—the great city of Hong Kong.

Now, we were promised that it would not come to this. We were told, when China joined the World Trade Organization, when China was given permanent normal trade relations, when China was ushered into this so-called community of nations, that it would liberalize China and that it would make the Chinese Communist Party more moderate. Well, I think we know how that has turned out.

After decades now of stealing our jobs, decades of ripping us off in trade, decades of impoverishing our own workers here in this country while stealing our intellectual property, decades of building its military on the backs of our middle class and our working people, now Beijing wants to dominate its region, snuff out Hong Kong, and then turn to the rest of the world.

We have to send a clear message that we will not stand idly by. We will not allow Beijing to erase the history of its misdeeds. We will not allow it to erase the history of Tiananmen. We will not allow it to erase the history of the concentration camps it is running at this very moment, and we will not stand by while it destroys the liberties and the rights of the people of Hong Kong.

It is time now for this body to stand and send a clear message that will call the other free nations to stand in support of the values we hold dear, in support of all that this country stands for, in support of the liberty of the people of Hong Kong.

I yield to my colleague Senator BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for the work he is doing as he brings forward this resolution for Hong Kong.

I want to take just a couple of minutes to remind those of us who have been watching this issue and have concerns about this resolution that the aggression we are seeing now is not something that is new. This is newly realized.

As those of us who have followed this and followed the dealings of the Chinese Communist Party know, the newest so-called national security law is nothing more than the party's response to the threat that uprisings and protests in Hong Kong pose to its hold on power. It just can't stand it. It watches the freedom fighters in Hong Kong, and it thinks: What if it gets away from us?

Hong Kong is our financial center, and it is watching what is happening in the rest of the free world. Australia, Canada, and the UK all have signed the official joint statement with us, the United States of America, expressing deep concern with this so-called national security legislation, which really is the Communist Party's way of stepping into Hong Kong and usurping the power—of going back on a deal it made long ago.

Beijing claims that it needs this law to control against "subversion of state power," but, again, anyone who has been paying attention knows that it will use this standard as an excuse to redefine "subversion" and engage in the violent repression of speech, association, and movement—with no cause and without mercy. This is how it has kept control. It is a pattern, and there is no reason to believe it is going to do anything differently this time around.

Over the past year, we have seen how willing Chinese officials are to trample every international norm, every law, every principle of diplomacy to force their hand on their own people and on other countries. Now, against all odds, forces in Beijing have found a way to make life in Hong Kong more dangerous than it has been by delegitimizing peaceful and nonviolent protests and journalism that doesn't mirror party propaganda. They have seized even more hope away from the freedom fighters who have captured the world's attention in their stunning displays of defiance.

It is really quite a battle that is taking place, and I thank my colleagues for the good work they have done in standing against the Chinese Communist Party's aggression.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for her tremendous work on this issue. I thank her for her leadership and for her strong stance in favor of the people of Hong Kong and their basic liberties, guaranteed to them by the international treaty commitments that Beijing has ascribed to, that Beijing has signed up for, and that it now seeks to violate with impunity.

Let's be clear about what Beijing wants. It says that Hong Kong is its

plaything to do with as it chooses. That is not the case. Beijing has undertaken internationally binding commitments, agreements, by which it has agreed to protect and honor the basic liberties of the people of Hong Kong, and it is those commitments that it is seeking to violate today with impunity. It is those commitments Beijing is seeking to wriggle out of just as it has, time and again, violated its agreements with this country, just as it has, time and again, cheated on its obligations to Americans.

That is another reason I am calling on the Senate today to pass a resolution that makes it our position that China has gone too far. We must go on record and tell the world that this new national security law—this fiat that has been issued by Beijing—is a violation of what Beijing has committed to. It is a violation of the fundamental liberties of the people of Hong Kong, and nothing less than freedom is at stake.

My resolution also calls on this administration to use every diplomatic means available to stay Beijing's hand. The President has already begun the process of downgrading Hong Kong's special trade status. We must build on that effort now by rallying nations—the free nations of the world—to pressure China to back down from their attempt to strip away the basic liberties of the people of Hong Kong because, in the end, Hong Kong's struggle is the struggle of all free people.

Do you know what I said when I had the chance to visit the city, see the protests, and be out on the streets myself last fall? That sometimes the fate of one city defines the struggle of a generation. In the 1960s, that city was Berlin. Today, that city is Hong Kong, and it is time for this body to take a stand.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, as if in legislative session, I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 596. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I am reserving the right to object.

As I listened carefully to the statements made by the Senator from Missouri about the aggressive and unacceptable conduct of the Government of

China, or Hong Kong, he is absolutely right, I believe, that it is important that the U.S. Senate—in fact, that the U.S. Government take action strongly expressing our disapproval but also take action to actually show the Government of China that there will be a price to pay if they continue down that path of aggression and try to snuff out the freedoms of the people of Hong Kong.

That is why, immediately after the Government of China announced its intentions to move in that direction, we introduced a bipartisan bill. Senator TOOMEY introduced the bill. I am proud to join him as a cosponsor. We have other Democratic and Republican cosponsors to the bill. I am pleased to see the Senator from North Dakota on the floor. He is a cosponsor of that bill. It is called the Hong Kong Autonomy Act.

In addition to expressing the sentiments that the Senator from Missouri lays out in his Senate resolution, it proposes that we take action as the Government of the United States. While we have heard statements from Secretary Pompeo, the reality is that this administration has not exercised any of its existing sanctions authority that it could take to express our strong disapproval of the actions the Government of China is proposing to take with respect to Hong Kong. That is why we introduced the bipartisan bill, again, outlining all the transgressions the Senator from Missouri talked about but actually doing something about them by requiring that the administration impose sanctions on individuals in the Government of China who are undermining the rights of the people in Hong Kong and requiring them to impose sanctions on Chinese Government entities that are depriving the people of Hong Kong of the freedoms the Senator talked about. It goes beyond that. It says that any bank that is aiding and abetting the Government of China in snuffing out the rights of the people of Hong Kong can be subject to sanctions.

Now, I know the Senator from Missouri knows the Government of China well enough to understand that the Senate passing a resolution and leaving it at that is not going to change their conduct. I think the Senator is enough of a student of the Chinese Communist Government to recognize that. So that is exactly why we introduced this bipartisan legislation because if we want to have any chance of influencing the conduct of the Government of China, we have to make it clear there will be a price to pay. There is no price to be paid in the Senate passing a resolution. It is a nice statement. I support the statement, but I am also a little tired of this body passing a lot of resolutions, sometimes thinking we have actually done something when we haven't changed a thing.

That is why I am here on the Senate floor to ask my colleagues to support what is a bipartisan bill that actually

has some teeth in it. It is not just a statement from the Senate. It is an action that will be taken by the Senate and the House and, hopefully, by this administration, which apparently doesn't want to take action. We have heard them already express concerns about this legislation.

I would hope that if our colleagues on the Republican side feel as strongly as the Senator from Missouri does, they would want to back up those words with legislative action, and they would want to back up those words with something that is more meaningful and something that tells the Government of China that we stand together in making sure there is a price to pay.

I know the Senator from Missouri has worked on other bills making it clear that we do not find acceptable all sorts of conduct by China. I have as well—bipartisan bills. I hope we can join together right here, right now, to support the expression—the statement—that the Senator from Missouri has brought to us but also go beyond that and send a signal right now that we, the U.S. Senate, want to be joined by the House and by the administration in putting action behind those words. That is exactly what the bipartisan Hong Kong Autonomy Act does.

So I would respectfully request that the Senator from Missouri modify his request to ask, in addition to what he proposed, that the Banking Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 3798, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons involved in the erosion of certain obligations of China with respect to Hong Kong; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri so modify his request?

Mr. HAWLEY. I do.

Is there objection to the request as modified?

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, it is clear to the five or six of us Senators who are in the room right now that there is passion, that it is an important issue, and that there may even be unanimous consent in the hearts and minds, certainly, of the Senators with regard to both the spirit of the resolution and perhaps the letter of the bill, of which I am a cosponsor, that has been introduced by UC by the Senator from Maryland.

I think it is clear that we all have the same objective here, but I also know there is just a handful of us in the room talking about a very important issue that may seem simple but we know is very complicated.

We know that the administration has provided both technical and policy

views on the bill, and I think with such an important issue that so many of us care deeply about, it deserves a little more discussion and debate than just to come to the floor with a UC.

I am committed, as a member of the Banking Committee and as a cosponsor, to working with both committees and with the chairs of both committees of jurisdiction over the resolution and the bill to make sure we get it right as opposed to this UC.

I want to work hard. I know you all do. I think we should work at looking at the comments from the administration, working together as Republicans and Democrats who care about this country, care about the people of Hong Kong, and who are concerned about the behavior of China. So I object to adoption of this bill before we have a chance to do exactly that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, it has been a little bit over 3 weeks since my constituent, George Floyd, was murdered by the Minneapolis police, and for a little over 3 weeks, millions of people have marched on the streets, raising their voices in grief and anguish to protest the police brutality and systemic racism that killed George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, Philando Castile, Jamar Clark, and so many others. But the killing hasn't stopped.

Just last Friday, police in Atlanta killed Rayshard Brooks, shooting him twice in the back. Just moments ago, it was announced that this officer will be charged.

The killing will not stop until we take action. The Senate needs to act now to take up and pass the Justice in Policing Act.

I joined my colleagues, Senators BOOKER and HARRIS, in introducing this bill last week. I am grateful for their strong leadership toward creating a more fair and equitable justice system.

The scale of the injustice can feel overwhelming, and the path can seem very long, but passing the Justice in Policing Act would provide concrete steps on that path. It is a necessary step toward stopping the killing and advancing our work to make transformative changes that we need to fulfill the promise of freedom and equality in America.

The Justice in Policing Act would make some of the changes that we urgently need to stop the scourge of police violence against communities of color. This legislation would prohibit some of the most dangerous police practices. It would strictly limit the use of force, and it would begin holding law enforcement accountable in a system that was designed to shield them from accountability.

First, the bill prohibits the most dangerous police practices. It would ban the use of choke holds like the ones the police used to kill George Floyd and

Eric Garner. It would also ban no-knock warrants like the one the police used when they killed Breonna Taylor in her own bed.

Choke holds pose an unacceptable risk, and that risk is not borne equally. Black men are nearly three times more likely to be killed by police use of force than White men.

The use of no-knock warrants also disproportionately harms communities of color. The practice was popularized in the 1990s as a tool in the war on drugs so that officers pursuing drug charges could enter a person's home unannounced, with guns drawn, inherently and unnecessarily endangering their lives.

Communities and activists have been warning us about the inherent danger and injustice of choke holds and no-knock warrants for decades. It is long past time to end the debate and to ban these practices nationally, but experience has shown us that it is not enough to ban egregious practices. When Los Angeles banned choke holds in 1982, officers took up batons to beat and subdue civilians.

In 1991, the officers who beat Rodney King actually argued that their actions were necessary because they weren't permitted to use a choke hold, and those officers were never held fully accountable.

American policing resists reform and accountability, so it is not enough for us to ban the most dangerous practices; we need to set a national standard for police use of force. That is what the Justice in Policing Act does.

Today, the current standard in law asks only if an officer's use of force was reasonable, and this makes it nearly impossible to hold officers accountable because the system—a system designed to protect officers, not Black and Brown bodies—has built up decades of precedent excusing officers from the harm that they cause. So if we are serious when we say that Black lives matter, if we are serious about our commitment to equal justice, we need to hold police officers to a higher standard of care in their use of force. That is why the Justice in Policing Act would set a national use of force standard that asks whether the force was necessary and hold officers accountable for exhausting other options before resorting to violence.

The Justice in Policing Act would eliminate qualified immunity for law enforcement officers and reset the impossibly high standard for convicting law enforcement officers of a crime. Today, our system effectively puts cops above the law by insulating them from civil and criminal liability when they violate the rights of those who they are sworn to serve. No one should be shielded from accountability for their actions in a free society.

When we change these rules, we will finally be able to provide long denied justice for victims of police brutality, their families, and their communities. But we will also be able to prevent such brutality in the first place.

When law enforcement officers believe that they will never face consequences for crossing the line, they will continue to ignore that line. The Justice in Policing Act will begin to make this change.

The House is poised to pass the Justice in Policing Act next week, and I urge this Senate to take it up. Let's debate it, and let's pass it.

We are at a crossroad, and we cannot fail to act. Four hundred years of structural racism cannot be erased by a single piece of legislation or with a single generation of legislators, but passing this bill is a crucial step toward ending the killing and the violence against communities of color. It is a necessary step on the path toward racial justice.

The path toward justice leads us toward transformative changes to redefining the role of policing in America. Reimagining policing means recognizing that not every social ill and every emergency is answered by calling in the armed officers. We have other better and more effective tools when dealing with the hurt of mental illness, of substance abuse, of homelessness, of economic insecurity. Reimagining policing means asking whether outfitting officers with military-grade weapons and equipment makes it safer—or does it escalate conflict and violence and encourage officers to see the communities they serve as hostile enemies?

Reimagining policing means addressing the overpolicing of communities of color. It means that we ask questions about whether anyone is really safer when we surveil neighborhoods, searching for possible violations. This only feeds the system of mass incarceration.

Reimagining policing means that we reassess our criminal code, our justice system, and our sentencing laws that irrevocably disrupt lives and communities for minor offenses with minimal impacts on public safety.

Above all, reimagining policing means recognizing that our current system is not inevitable; it is the result of thousands and thousands of policy choices made over, literally, hundreds of years, designed to control and punish Black and Brown and indigenous communities—choices that compound injustice and unequal opportunity.

As we imagine a new way forward, we need to face some uncomfortable truths about the history of policing in our country. We can, and we must, make different choices this time. We know better, and we have to do better.

I want to close by thanking the community leaders and young activists who are showing us the path forward. This path requires us to be courageous. It requires us to be humble. It requires us to be uncomfortable. It requires us to listen. But it is a path rooted in love and in trust and in hope.

I am committed to walking this path with my constituents, and I am hopeful that my colleagues and my fellow American citizens will join me.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

TELEHEALTH

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, it is hard to think of much good that has come out of the 3-month experience with COVID-19, but here is one thing: the number of patients who have seen their doctors remotely through the internet, FaceTime, and all of the other remote technologies we have, including the telephone. We call that telehealth.

Our Health Committee this morning had a fascinating hearing on telehealth. There was a lot of bipartisan interest from the Senators—Democrat and Republican Senators. The Senator from Minnesota was the ranking member of the committee today at the request of Senator MURRAY. My sense at the end of the hearing was that there were a number of things we agreed on.

I ask unanimous consent that my opening statement at the hearing today be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

My colleague, the Senator from Tennessee who is presiding today, and I both know Tim Adams, who is the CEO of the Saint Thomas hospital system in Middle Tennessee.

He told me on the phone last week that Saint Thomas employs about 800 physicians in its several hospitals. During the month of February, there were 60,000 visits between physicians and patients in the Saint Thomas system. Only 50 of those 60,000 were by telehealth, were remote. But during the 2 months of March and April, Ascension Saint Thomas conducted more than 30,000 telehealth visits. That is 50 to 30,000—more than 45 percent of all of the visits between patients and doctors during that time.

Tim Adams expects that to level off, but there will still be probably 15 to 20 percent of all of Saint Thomas 60,000 visits a month by telehealth.

I talked to the CEO of the largest hospital in San Francisco a few weeks ago, and he said that during February, about 5 percent of their visits between doctors and patients were telehealth. He said that was a very high percentage for a hospital. But in March, it was more than half, more than 50 percent.

Think about that for just a moment. There were 884 million visits in 2016 between doctors and patients, according to the Centers for Disease Control. If 15 to 20 to 25 percent of those were suddenly by telehealth instead of in-office visits, that would mean hundreds of millions of visits a year would be by telehealth. It is hard for me to imagine that there has been a bigger change in the delivery of healthcare services in recent history or maybe in our country's history than the sudden shift to telehealth in visits between patients and doctors.

Telehealth has been around for a long time. Our witnesses testified to that. We had some excellent witnesses. Dr. Rheuban from the University of Virginia; Dr. Kvedar from Harvard, who is

the new president of the American Telemedicine Association; Dr. Arora, who is the founder of Project ECHO, which is well known across the country; and Dr. Andrea Willis, who is the chief medical officer of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Tennessee, which apparently is the first major insurance company to say that it will insure telehealth visits in the same way that it insures other visits.

What I recommended following the hearing was that two of the policy changes—which I judge to be the two most important changes in policy that the Federal Government made—be made permanent.

The first is that physicians can be reimbursed for a telehealth appointment wherever the patient is, including the patient's home. That would change the originating site rule, as it is called.

The second is that Medicare, during COVID-19, has begun to reimburse providers for nearly twice as many types of telehealth services. That rule, those changes, I believe, also should be made permanent.

What has happened is that we have had an incredible pilot program on telehealth. We have crammed 10 years of experience into 3 months, and we have a rare opportunity to look at the 3 months of experience and make a decision about what works, what doesn't work, and right the rules of the road for the future.

It is not just the Federal Government changing, I think, a total of 31 different policies, all of which we should examine, but States have made some changes too. Those changes involve allowing individuals to cross State lines more easily to get appointments with doctors with whom they need to talk.

Then the private sector is beginning to change too. I don't know of other insurance companies that have done what Tennessee Blue Cross Blue Shield did, but I know there will be some who decide on their own to begin to move to cover those services.

Senator BRAUN and Senator CASSIDY on our committee brought up the point that we want to watch carefully to see that we are not just adding to the cost of healthcare by telehealth; in fact, we ought to have an opportunity to reduce it. Our goal is always, when delivering healthcare services, to have as an objective a better outcome, a lower cost, and a better patient experience. It may very well be possible that telehealth not only improves the patient experience—we have had very few complaints about the experience of that—and improves the outcomes, but it may also lower costs, which is a major objective of our committee.

Last week, 10 days ago, I issued a white paper about the changes I thought we needed to make—Congress needs to make—so that we could be well prepared for the next pandemic after COVID-19, the one we know will surely come. We don't know when, we don't know what the name of the virus will be, but we know it will come, and

we need to take a number of steps to be as well prepared for that virus as we can.

Whether its accelerating treatments and testing and finding a vaccine or collecting data in a different way or better coordination of Federal officials, all of those things are part of what we need to examine, and we need to do that this year—this year—because our attention spans are short in this country. We move on quickly to the next crisis. While COVID-19 is fresh on our minds, we should do whatever we need to do to get ready for the next crisis. We should do those things this year.

Among those things we need to do this year is to make permanent the changes in Federal policy on telehealth that allowed this explosion of doctor and patient meetings by remote visits. People have been trying to think of ways to do this for a long time. Unfortunately, it took a pandemic to cause it to happen. Now, while we can see the result, make sure we don't have unintended consequences that are unfortunate. While we are doing that, we need to make those changes.

So I recommend to my colleagues, the testimony from our excellent witnesses this morning. There were 884 million doctor-patient visits in 2016 in the United States, and very few of them were by telehealth. In the future, the estimates are there could be as many as 20, 25, 30 percent of all of them, hundreds of millions of doctor-patient visits, by telehealth. That most likely is the largest change in the delivery of medical services that our country has ever seen.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OPENING STATEMENT

##### TELEHEALTH: LESSONS FROM THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC—JUNE 17, 2020

I spoke recently with Tim Adams, the CEO of Ascension Saint Thomas Health, which has 9 hospitals in Middle Tennessee and employs over 800 physicians, who told me that in February before COVID-19, there were about 60,000 visits between patients and physicians each month.

Almost all of those visits were done in person. Only about 50 were done remotely through telehealth using the internet.

But during the last two months, Ascension Saint Thomas conducted more than 30,000 telehealth visits—or around 45 percent of all its visits—because of changes in government policy and the inability of many patients to see doctors in person during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Tim Adams expects that to level off at 15-20 percent of all its visits going forward.

The largest hospital in San Francisco told me that 5 percent of its visits in February were conducted through telehealth—and the hospital considered that to be a very high number. Then in March, telehealth visits made up more than half of all its visits.

Because of COVID-19, our health care sector and government have been forced to cram 10 years' worth of telehealth experience into just the past three months.

As dark as this pandemic event has been, it creates an opportunity to learn from and act upon these three months of intensive telehealth experiences, specifically what perma-

nent changes need to be made in federal and state policies.

In 2016, there were almost 884 million visits nationwide between patients and physicians, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. If, as Tim Adams expects, 15-20 percent of those were to become remote due to telehealth expansion during COVID-19—that would produce a massive change in our health care system.

Our job should be to ensure that change is done with the goals of better outcomes and better experiences at a lower cost.

Part of this explosion in remote meetings between patients and physicians has been made possible by temporary changes in federal and state policies. The private sector, too, has made important changes. One purpose of this hearing is to find out which of these temporary changes in federal policy should be maintained, modified, or reversed—and also to find out if there are any additional federal policies that would help patients and health care providers take advantage of delivering medical services using telehealth.

Of the 31 federal policy changes, the three most important are:

1. Physicians can be reimbursed for a telehealth appointment wherever the patient is, including in the patient's home. That change was to the so-called "originating site" rule, which previously required that the patient live in a rural area and use telehealth at a doctor's office or clinic.

2. Medicare began to reimburse providers for nearly twice as many types of telehealth services, including: emergency department visits, initial nursing facility visits and discharges, and therapy services.

3. Doctors are allowed to conduct appointments using common video apps on your phone, like Apple FaceTime, or phone texting apps, or even on a landline call, which required relaxing federal privacy and security rules from the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, or HIPAA.

Many states made changes as well, most importantly making it easier for doctors to continue to see their patients who may have traveled out of state during the pandemic.

For example, a college student from Memphis, who attends college in North Carolina and has a doctor she sees in Chapel Hill, was able to go home to Tennessee during the pandemic and continue seeing her Chapel Hill doctor by FaceTime. Or, a patient in Iowa has been able to start seeing a new psychiatrist in Nashville.

The private sector adapted to these changes, too. One of our witnesses today is from Blue Cross Blue Shield of Tennessee, which has already begun to make permanent adjustments to its telehealth coverage policies based on some of the temporary federal changes in Medicare.

Looking forward, of the three major federal changes, my instinct is that the originating site rule change and the expansion of covered telehealth services should be made permanent.

One purpose of this hearing is to hear from the experts and discuss whether there may be unintended consequences, positive or negative, if Congress were to do that.

It's also important to examine the other 28 temporary changes in federal policy.

The question of whether to extend the HIPAA privacy waivers should be considered carefully. There are privacy and security concerns about the use of personal medical information by technology platform companies, as well as concerns about criminals hacking into these platforms. When HIPAA notification requirements are waived, a person might not even know that their personal information has been accessed by hackers.

Additionally, several of these technology platforms have said they want to adjust their platforms to conform with the HIPAA rules.

Another lesson from these three months is that telehealth or teleworking or tele-learning is not always the answer, especially for people in rural areas or low-income urban areas who do not have access to broadband.

And still another lesson is that personal relationships involved in health care, education, and the workplace cannot always be replaced by remote technology. Children have learned about all they want to learn over the internet, patients like to see their doctors, and workplaces benefit from employees actually talking and working with one another in person. There are some limits on remote learning, health care, and working.

There are obvious benefits to allowing health care providers to serve patients across state lines during a public health crisis. As a former governor, I am reluctant to override state decisions, but it may be possible to encourage further participation in interstate compacts or reciprocity agreements.

Last week I released a white paper on steps that Congress should take before the end of the year in order to get ready for the next pandemic. One of those recommendations was to make sure that patients do not lose the benefits that they have gained from using telehealth during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Even with an event as significant as COVID-19, memories fade and attention moves quickly to the next crisis, so it is important for Congress to act on legislation this year.

Because of this 10 years of telehealth experience crammed into 3 months—patients, doctors, nurses, therapists, and caregivers can write some new rules of the road, and should do so while the experiences still are fresh on everyone's minds.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### THE COOL ONLINE ACT

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I rise today to encourage all Americans to join the fight to support our Nation and our jobs and stand up against the growing threat of Communist China. I have been saying it for months, but the best way each and every one of us can make a difference is to buy American products whenever possible. It is time we addressed the new Cold War occurring between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party and be crystal clear about the negative impacts of continuing to buy Chinese-made products.

Communist China is stealing American jobs and technology and spying on our citizens. Data collected by Chinese companies is shared with the Communist Government of China, which is focused solely on global domination. Xi, the General Secretary of the China

Communist Party, is a dictator and human rights violator who is denying basic rights to the people of Hong Kong, cracking down on dissidents, militarizing the South China Sea, and imprisoning more than 1 million Uighurs in internment camps simply because of their religion.

The coronavirus pandemic should be the last straw. We can no longer rely on other countries like Communist China for our critical supply chain. Washington politicians have been too concerned with short-term political success and have long ignored the long-term threats to our way of life.

It is time for action. Now, more than ever, Americans must remember that every time we buy a product made in China, we are putting another dollar into the pockets of the people who steal our technology, deny people their basic human rights, and are propping up dangerous dictators like Maduro in Venezuela.

I am proud to lead my colleagues in a bipartisan resolution calling on Americans to buy products made in the United States whenever possible. Buying American is not partisan, and I am glad my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are coming together to encourage Americans to take a stand.

I know it is not always easy, but it is an important step we can all take at home to support American jobs, American producers, and American manufacturers and help build up the U.S. supply chain.

I am also working with Senator BALDWIN to pass our COOL Online Act, which will make sure all goods sold online list their country of origin to create more transparency for American consumers.

In my State, we take immense pride in products made in Florida. It is a driving force that led to our incredible economic turnaround. A return to this pride in homegrown businesses ensures America remains strong and the undisputed leader in the global economy. We must all do our part to support our Nation and make it clear to Communist China that the United States will not stand for their behavior.

I am committed to supporting American businesses over Chinese products. I hope my colleagues will join me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Tennessee.

#### PROTESTS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, for more than 200 years, the American people have exercised their right to petition the government for a redress of grievances. We understand how very vitally important it is for each of us to have that right to petition our government, to have our say.

But just as we learned from our moms and dads when we were kids, there is a right way and there is a wrong way to get things done when we feel that, in our opinion, the government has fallen short. I would understand if this differentiation between right and wrong sometimes causes con-

fusion because, although the American people are united in their desire for justice and equality, that sense of unity, they feel, is under attack.

Over the past few weeks, we watched thousands of protesters peacefully march in the memory of George Floyd and countless other Black Americans who have been killed—who have lost their lives at the hands of law enforcement. Sometimes these protests are vigils, and they are very quiet. There are other times they fill the streets and they are a bit disruptive and they demand accountability from their government in a way that has really captured the attention of the entire world.

On the other side, however, we have watched professional agitators who have come into some of these protests, and then they have turned them into riots. The self-prescribed culture warriors silence anyone and anything that deviates from their own chosen narrative, and that is very unfortunate.

The paths we take to achieve our desired outcomes are informed by the goals we have, not the other way around. This is why we must question the goals of those whose activism has taken a repressive turn because peaceful protest is an essential element of addressing government. That is how you achieve change. That is how you get people with you and working with you. It is a part of who we are.

This absolute protection against suppression in any form makes the recent dismantling of meaningful public discourse all the more disturbing because as you look back through our Nation's history, you realize freedom and freedom's cause has been well served by robust, respectful, bipartisan debate—hearing all voices.

Do you remember how sometimes we would joke about the cancel culture because it was the product of social media influencers and overenthusiastic fan clubs? What we see now is that has taken hold of the entertainment industry, corporations, and editorial boards. Outrage manufactured along partisan lines dominates every news cycle, all in an intentional and targeted effort to divide the American people and, thereby, what would that do? It destroys our cultural identity. If this isn't what chilling speech looks like, then I don't know what does.

I would like to be able to say this body stands united against this wave of malice or that I am confident we have demonstrated a commitment to real reform, but I fear that we have not yet arrived at that place. In spite of everything, in spite of it being clear that those who seek to divide and destroy this country are working just as hard as those who seek to unite it, other priorities remain in play. This has become especially evident today.

#### JUSTICE ACT

Last week, my friend and colleague Senator TIM SCOTT from South Carolina announced that he was leading a working group with the goal of drafting a comprehensive police reform bill.



You all know what happened next. He spoke about it just a few hours ago, but I think it is important to get on the record just one more time today that he deserves our thanks, and he deserves credit.

Before Senator SCOTT had a chance to write a single word of his bill, some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were ready to shut it down. It was stunning. Let me read you a few of these statements.

Someone said they suspect it “is going to be window dressing.” Another said: “It’s so far from being relevant to really the crisis at hand.” Another: “This is not a time for lowest common denominator, watered down reforms.” And then there was another unfortunate comment for which an apology was offered late today, and that apology was accepted. All of this is disappointing. It is hurtful, yes, but disappointing because this is a time when we have to carry on. We have to move forward.

Senator SCOTT announced the introduction of the JUSTICE Act. I am honored to be a cosponsor of that legislation, and I think it is imperative that we move forward with our discussions and our deliberations just as we would with any other bill. This Chamber is going to find a way to move forward with suggestions, but, above all, I urge my colleagues to consider some of the words that have been said. I urge them to take those words to heart, and I urge them to remember what we are fighting for and to stop focusing so hard on whom you have convinced yourself that you should be fighting against.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### POLICING REFORM

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as everybody knows, this country faces an extraordinary set of crises—crises that are unprecedented in the modern history of our country.

Over the last several weeks, hundreds of thousands of Americans have taken to the streets and courageously demanded an end to police murder and brutality and to urge us all to rethink the nature of policing in America. In the midst of all that, we continue, of course, to suffer from the COVID-19 pandemic, which has taken the lives of over 115,000 Americans and infected over 2 million of our people.

Then, on top of that, we are experiencing the worst economic meltdown since the Great Depression of the 1930s, with over 32 million Americans having lost their jobs in the last 3 months. In the midst of all of that, enough truly is enough.

The U.S. Senate must respond to the pain and the suffering of our constituents. Let us begin work today, not next week, not next month but right now in addressing the unprecedented crises our people are facing. If there is anything that the torture and murder of George Floyd by Minneapolis police has taught us, it is that we have to fundamentally rethink the nature of policing in America and reform our broken and racist criminal justice system.

Let us be clear—and I think everybody understands this—the murder of George Floyd is not just an isolated incident. It is the latest in an endless series of police killings of African Americans, including Rayshard Brooks, Eric Garner, Sandra Bland, Laquan McDonald, Tamir Rice, Alton Sterling, Freddie Gray, Rekia Boyd, Walter Scott, and many, many others.

The American people are rightly demanding justice and an end to police brutality and murder. And we have to hear that cry coming from all across this country, from large cities and small towns, and the Senate must act and act now.

Here is some good news in the midst of a lot of bad news, and that is thanks to a massive grassroots movement, the Senate will finally begin to debate legislation dealing with the police. That is a good thing. The bad news is that the Republican legislation, at least what I have seen this morning, goes nowhere near far enough as to where we need to go.

Now is not the time to think small or respond with superficial, bureaucratic proposals. Now is not the time for more studies. Now is the time to hold racist and corrupt police officers and police departments accountable for their actions. Now is the time to implement far-reaching reforms that would protect people and communities that have suffered police brutality, torture, and murder for far too long. Now is the time to act boldly to protect the First Amendment right to protest.

Let me very briefly describe some of the areas in which I think the Congress should move with regard to police brutality and the whole issue of policing.

First, and maybe most importantly, every police officer in our country must be held accountable, and those found guilty must be punished with the full force of law. That includes officers who stand by while brutal acts take place. Every single killing of a person by police or while in police custody must be investigated by the Department of Justice.

We must create a process by which police departments look like the communities they serve and be part of those communities, not be seen as invading, heavily armed, occupying forces. That is not what police departments should look like. We must, therefore, prohibit the transfer of Department of Defense military equipment to police departments.

Further, we need to abolish qualified immunity so police officers are held

civily liable for abuses. We need to strip Federal funds from departments that violate civil rights. We need to provide funding to States and municipalities to create a civilian core of unarmed first responders to supplement law enforcement.

For too long, we have asked police departments to do things which they are not trained or prepared to do, and we have criminalized societal problems like addiction and homelessness and mental illness, severe problems that exist in every State in the country. But these are not problems that will be solved by incarceration. We are not going to solve the crisis of addiction or homelessness or mental illness by incarceration. We have done that for too long, and it is a failed approach.

We need to make records of police misconduct publicly available so that an officer with a record of misconduct cannot simply move two towns over and start again. We need to require all jurisdictions that receive Federal grant funding to establish independent police conduct review boards that are broadly representative of the community and that have the authority to refer deaths that occur at the hands of police or in police custody to Federal authorities for investigation. We need to amend Federal civil rights laws to allow more effective prosecution of police misconduct by changing the standard from willfulness to recklessness. We need to ban the use of facial recognition technology by the police.

Finally, and certainly not least importantly, we need to legalize marijuana. In the midst of the many crises we face as a country, it is absurd that, under the Federal Controlled Substances Act, marijuana is at schedule 1, along with killer drugs like heroin. State after State have moved to legalize marijuana, and it is time for the Federal Government to do the same. When we talk about police department reform, we must end police officers continuing to arrest, search, or jail the people of our country, predominantly people of color, for using marijuana.

We need to ban the use of rubber bullets, pepper spray, and tear gas on protesters. The right to protest, the right to demonstrate is a fundamental, constitutional right and a right that must be respected.

#### RACISM

But let us be clear. Police violence is not the only manifestation of the systemic racism that is taking place in America today. Just take a look at what is going on with the COVID-19 pandemic. In recent months, we have seen Black and Brown communities disproportionately ravaged by this virus. We have seen workers, who earn starvation wages, forced to go to work day in and day out in unhealthy workplace environments because, without that paycheck, they and their families would go hungry. These working class families have, with enormous courage, kept our economy and society together in hospitals, in meat-packing plants, in



public transportation, in supermarkets, gas stations, and elsewhere.

These workers—again, disproportionately Black and Brown—have risked infection and death so that the rest of us can continue to get the food that we need, get our medicines, or put gasoline in our car. In the wealthiest country in the history of the world, workers should not have to choose between going hungry on one hand or getting ill or dying on the other.

When we talk about starvation wages in this country, I was happy to hear today that Target has raised its minimum wage for its many, many thousands of workers to \$15 an hour. That is something that I and many others here have long advocated for. This follows a decision 2 years ago by Amazon to raise the minimum wage for their workers to \$15 an hour and the effort in seven States across this country to raise their minimum wage to \$15 an hour.

Now is the time for Walmart—the largest employer in America, owned by the wealthiest family in America—to also raise their minimum wage to \$15 an hour. I should add that the Walton family, the family that owns Walmart, can more than afford to do this because, since Donald Trump has been President, their wealth has increased by about \$75 billion. Let me repeat. Their wealth has increased by about \$75 billion in the last 3-plus years, and they are now worth some \$200 billion as a family. You know what? I think the Walton family can afford to pay their workers \$15 an hour.

By the way, when we talk about racial justice, please understand that about half of Black workers in this country earn less than \$15 an hour.

Further, the House has done the right thing by passing legislation to raise the Federal minimum wage to \$15 an hour. The time is long overdue for the Senate to do the same.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Despite what we hear from the Trump administration, the COVID-19 pandemic is far from over. In fact, as you may know, nine States today—nine States—hit record highs for new cases in a single day. What we have seen unfold over the last several months and continue to see unfold is an administration that continues to ignore the recommendations from scientists and physicians.

No one doubts anymore, for example, that masks can play an important role in cutting back on the transmission of the virus. We need to utilize the Defense Production Act and manufacture the hundreds of millions of high-quality masks our people and our medical personnel desperately need. As part of the Defense Authorization Act, I will be offering an amendment to do just that. Other countries around the world are sending masks on a regular basis to all of their people. We can and should do exactly the same thing.

Not only do we need to act boldly and aggressively to address this horrific

pandemic that we are experiencing, not only do we need to act boldly to fix a broken and racist criminal justice system, but we need to respond with a fierce sense of urgency to the worst economic crisis in the modern history of our country.

Over the last 3 months, over 30 million Americans have lost their jobs, and because half of our people live paycheck to paycheck, having virtually nothing in savings, many of those people are now facing economic desperation. Today, all across our country, tens of millions of Americans are in danger of going hungry. In Vermont and in States all over America, we are seeing long lines of people in their cars lining up in order to get food that the Federal Government is now supplying.

But it is not just food. Millions of Americans are frightened to death that they will soon be evicted from their apartments or lose their homes to foreclosure. Imagine that. In the middle of an economic meltdown, in the middle of a pandemic, millions of people are in danger of being thrown out onto the streets.

Further, as part of the economic crisis, we are in danger of losing over half the small businesses in this country within the next 6 months—impossible to contemplate. Half of all small businesses in America are threatened with destruction.

I would say to Senator MCCONNELL and the Republican leadership here in the Senate that the American people cannot afford to wait. They need our help now, not a month from now, not 2 months from now. We need to respond vigorously to the enormous economic pain and suffering and anxiety that the American people, today, are experiencing.

What does that mean specifically? It means, among other things, that the Federal Government must guarantee 100 percent of the paychecks and benefits of American workers up to \$90,000 a year through a Paycheck Security Act, which is legislation that I introduced with Senators WARNER, JONES, and BLUMENTHAL. Countries in Europe that have taken this approach have not experienced the skyrocketing levels of unemployment we have seen here in the United States.

As a result of the economic downturn, we know that over 16 million Americans have already lost their health insurance. Further, there are estimates that that number could go as high as 43 million people losing their health insurance, and that is on top of the 87 million Americans who were already uninsured or underinsured before the pandemic.

Responding with a fierce sense of urgency to the economic crisis means that, in the midst of the horrific pandemic, every man, woman, and child in this country must receive the healthcare they need, regardless of their income. That means that Medicare must be empowered to pay all of the healthcare bills of the uninsured

and underinsured until this crisis is over. If this crisis has taught us anything, it has taught us that we are only as safe as the least insured among us.

Responding with a fierce sense of urgency means providing every working-class person in America with a \$2,000 emergency payment each and every month until this crisis is over, so that they can pay the rent, feed their families, and make ends meet. A one-time \$1,200 check does not cut it. An emergency \$2,000 monthly payment will serve also as a major stimulus in reviving the economy.

Responding with a fierce sense of urgency means making sure that no one in America goes hungry, which means that we have got to substantially expand the Meals on Wheels program, the school meals program, and SNAP benefits.

Responding with a fierce sense of urgency means making sure that the Postal Service receives the emergency funding that it desperately needs. If we could bail out large corporations, if we could provide over \$1 trillion in tax breaks to the wealthy and the powerful, please do not tell me that we cannot save and strengthen the Postal Service, an agency of huge importance to our entire economy.

Acting with a fierce sense of urgency means extending the \$600 a week in expanded unemployment benefits that expires in July. Failure to extend these benefits would slash the incomes of millions of Americans by 50, 60 or even 70 percent. You can't do that in the midst of an economic crisis.

Here we are today. We are in the midst of the worst public health crisis in over 100 years, and the Republican Senate is doing nothing about it. We are in the midst of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. People all over this country in every State in America are financially hurting, and the Republican Senate today is doing nothing about that. We continue to see African Americans brutally murdered and tortured by racist police officers, and the Republican Senate leadership proposes a woefully inadequate solution.

Now, I understand that not everyone in America is hurting, not everyone in America needs help from the Senate. While over 32 million Americans have lost jobs during this horrific pandemic, 630 billionaires in America have seen their wealth go up by \$565 billion—amazing, but true. Over the first 3 months of this horrific pandemic, America's top 630 billionaires have seen their wealth go up by \$565 billion—hard to believe.

In other words, at a time of massive income and wealth inequality, which is already today worse than at any time since the 1920s, a horrific situation is becoming much worse. During the last 3 months, while the very, very rich have become much richer, American households have seen their wealth go down by \$6.5 trillion. Billionaires see their wealth increase by over \$600 billion; American households see their

wealth go down by \$6.5 trillion. In the midst of everything else that we are experiencing, we are currently witnessing what is likely the greatest transfer of wealth from the middle class and the poor to the very rich in the modern history of our country.

In the midst of these unprecedented crises, it is time for the Senate to act in an unprecedented way. In every State in this country, our constituents are hurting, and they are calling out for help. Let us hear their cries. Let us hear their pain. Let us act and act now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

CHINA

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor this evening to talk about China and to talk about how we can have a better relationship with China, one that is fair and equitable.

I am going to talk specifically about some of the investigations and reports that we have worked on here in the U.S. Congress over the past couple of years. I am going to be talking about four specific reports that came out of what is called the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. I chair that subcommittee. It is under the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and it is a committee that takes these investigations seriously. We do a fair, objective, thorough job. All of our investigations are bipartisan. I am going to talk a little about why these investigations that we have done have led me to the conclusion that we need to do much more here in this country to be able to respond to China and to be able to have the kind of fair and equitable relationship that we should all desire.

A lot of China's critics talk about the fact that China needs to do things differently, and I don't disagree with most of that, but the reality is there is much we can do right here in this country to create a situation in which we do not have the issues that I will talk about tonight—some of the unfair activities that have occurred here in this country. Frankly, I think we have been naive and not properly prepared. I will also talk about some legislation that we are proposing tomorrow morning, which will focus on how to make America more effective at pushing back against a specific threat to our research and our intellectual property.

Our goal is not to have China as an enemy. Our goal is to actually have China as a strategic partner, wherein there is a fair and equitable and sustainable relationship, but it is going to require some changes. Again, I am going to focus tonight on some changes we need to make right here, changes that are within our control.

Our investigations have been thorough—in fact, driven—and our reports have been objective, bipartisan, and eye-opening, and I encourage you to go on the PSI website—psi.gov—and check it out.

Our first report was in February of 2019. It detailed a lack of transparency

and reciprocity, among other concerns, with the Confucius Institutes that China operates here in this country. These Confucius Institutes are at our colleges and universities. Some people are aware of that, but some may not be aware that they are also at our elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools. Our reports show how these Confucius Institutes have been a tool to stifle academic freedom where they are located, toeing the Chinese Communist Party line on sensitive issues like Tibet or Taiwan or the Uighurs or Tiananmen Square.

By the way, when I talk about China tonight, I hope people realize I am not talking about the Chinese people. I am talking about the Chinese Government; therefore, I am talking about the Chinese Communist Party. With regard to the Confucius Institutes, for example, which are spread around this country, ultimately, they report to a branch of the Chinese Government that is involved with spreading positive propaganda about China. Ultimately, it is controlled by whom? The Chinese Communist Party.

So I hope the comments I make tonight will not be viewed as comments that are regarding the Chinese people as much as a small group in China, the Chinese Communist Party, that, with regard to the Confucius Institutes and other approaches it has taken to the United States, have led to these issues.

By the way, it is thanks to our report and to the broader scrutiny that followed that we learned about the lack of academic freedom and about the fact that history is being taught a certain way at the Confucius Institutes. By the way, it also pointed out that the Chinese language is taught. It is a good thing to have this intercultural dialogue and the opportunity to learn more about China, but there needs to be, again, an understanding and a history of China that is fair and honest, which does include discussions of what happened in Tiananmen Square or what is happening today with regard to the Uighurs—a minority group in China that is being oppressed.

In the year that followed our scrutiny—so, really, in the last year and a few months—23 of the, roughly, 100 Confucius Institutes on college campuses in America have closed, and others have made some positive changes as to how they operate. So I believe our report made a significant difference in terms of how we relate to the Confucius Institutes.

I said earlier that one of my concerns about the Confucius Institutes was the lack of reciprocity. When our State Department has attempted to set up something comparable on Chinese university campuses, it has been unable to do so. In fact, whereas the Confucius Institute employees and members of the Chinese Government are able to come on our college campuses, we are told that U.S. Government officials and, for that matter, private citizens cannot go on Chinese campuses with-

out having a minder, somebody to be there to monitor what they are doing. Sometimes they are not permitted to go at all, which goes to the lack of reciprocity.

Yet my goal, really, is to, again, talk about what we can do here. I would urge those tonight who are watching and who are connected with a college or a university that still has a Confucius Institute—or a high school or a middle school or an elementary school—to check it out. Check out our report in which we have many instances when the American students who are learning there are not getting the full story. That may not be true in the case of all Confucius Institutes, but I would recommend that you do the research yourself.

Then, in March of 2019, after the Confucius Institute report, our report into the Equifax data breach here in America showed how China had targeted private U.S. companies and stolen the information of millions of Americans. In the Equifax data breach of 2017, which we studied and which is one of the largest in history, the personal information of 147 million Americans was stolen by IP addresses that originated in China. So we should just be aware of that, and we should take precautions and protections and encryptions and security measures here to avoid it. Again, this is about our doing more here in this country to be prepared for the reality of the 21st century.

Then, in November of last year, we released another eye-opening report, this one detailing the rampant theft of U.S. taxpayer-funded research and intellectual property by China by way of its so-called talent recruitment programs—meaning, China systematically finds promising researchers who are doing work on research that China is interested in, and China recruits them. These programs have not been subtle. The Thousand Talents Plan is the most understood of these programs, although there are a couple hundred others. Yet we showed, in studying the Thousand Talents Plan, how this problem has been ongoing for two decades in this country. Through this program, much of what China has taken from our labs and then taken to China has gone directly toward fueling the rise of the Chinese economy and the Chinese military.

Again, this is about China, but it is really about us. How have we let this happen?

Specifically, we found that the Chinese Government has targeted this promising, U.S.-based research and its researchers. Often, this research is funded by U.S. taxpayers. As taxpayers, we spend \$115 million a year on research to places like the National Institutes of Health or to the National Science Foundation or to the Department of Energy for basic science research. It has been a good investment because, through some of these investments, we have discovered cures to particular kinds of cancer and technologies that have helped our military,

but it is not good if the U.S. taxpayer is paying for this research and then China is taking it.

China has not just taken some of this research funded by U.S. taxpayers but has paid these grant recipients to take their research over to the Chinese universities in China—again, universities that are affiliated with the Chinese Communist Party. This is not about the people of China. This is about the Chinese Communist Party, and it has been very clever. It wants to make sure that China is a stronger competitor against us, so it literally takes the research from the United States to a lab in China where it tries to replicate the research and provide the money to these researchers.

Just last week, we released a fourth PSI report that showed that this problem of China's not playing by the rules extends to the telecommunications space as well. Let me explain that situation. Then I will go back to the Thousand Talents Program.

You may remember that, in May of last year, the FCC prohibited a company called China Mobile and its U.S. subsidiary from providing telecom services from the United States on the grounds that doing so would jeopardize our national security—the first time such a ruling had been issued. The fact that this was only the first time that a foreign telecommunications company had been denied approval to operate in the U.S. on national security grounds prompted us to investigate other Chinese state-owned carriers that were already authorized to operate in the United States. We asked an important question: Why was China Mobile USA any different than these other three Chinese companies?

We discovered in our report, which again we issued just a month ago, that it wasn't different. We conducted a yearlong investigation into the government processes for reviewing, approving, and monitoring Chinese state-owned telecommunications firms operating here in the United States, and we found, once again, over the years, the Federal Government had been lax when it comes to securing our telecommunications networks against risks posed by Chinese state-owned carriers. Again, it is what we can do here in this country that we haven't done.

In fact, three Chinese state-owned carriers have been operating in the U.S. for nearly 20 years, but it has only been in recent years that the FCC, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Homeland Security have focused on the potential risks these firms bring when they operate in the United States. What we didn't know 20 years ago, we do know today, and we should use that information to protect ourselves.

We now know that the Chinese Government views telecommunications as a strategic industry and has expended significant resources to create and promote new business opportunities for its state-owned carriers. We also learned

in our investigation and said in our report that Chinese state-owned telecommunications carriers are “subject to exploitation, influence, and control by the Chinese government” and can be used in the Chinese government's cyber and economic espionage efforts aimed at the United States.

This isn't a surprise. We have seen this time and time again that the Chinese Government targets the United States through cyber and economic espionage activities and enlists its state-owned entities in these efforts. The Chinese telecommunications firms have been part of our U.S. telecommunications industry as a result, and, of course, that is critical to our everyday life. Its services from cellular networks to broadband internet connections help break down barriers between people, nations, and continents. That is good. It has helped our economy and the economies of many other countries grow immensely. We all benefit when telecommunications are global.

It makes sense then that the Federal Government has tasked the FCC with ensuring that foreign telecommunications can establish a foothold in the United States, but only if it is done in a fair and safe manner. Again, what we have learned is that the FCC and other Federal agencies have been slow to respond to the national security threats these telecom companies can pose in terms of cyber security and economic espionage.

As we detail in our report, the FCC, which lacks the national security and law enforcement expertise required to assess these risks, has turned to other executive branch agencies to assess them, specifically the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense, a group commonly known as the Team Telecom.

Team Telecom was an informal arrangement and has lacked formal authority to operate, making it overall an ineffective solution to assessing these risks. The informality has resulted in protracted review periods and a process FCC Commissioners have described as broken and an inextricable black hole that provided “no clarity for the future.”

For example, Team Telecom's review of China Mobile USA's application lasted for 7 years. This points to a troubling trend we have found in all of these reports—how, frankly, our government and our institutions over a space of time, the last couple of decades, have permitted China to take advantage of lax U.S. oversight, be it on our college campuses, our research labs, or in cyberspace.

At our PSI hearing on the Thousand Talents report, the FBI witness before us acknowledged as much saying:

With our present day knowledge of the threat from Chinese talent plans, we wish we had taken more rapid and comprehensive action in the past. And the time to make up for that is now.

That is our own Federal Bureau of Investigation. Again: “We wish we had taken more rapid and comprehensive action in the past.” They don't say that often, but it is true, and I commend them for saying it at the hearing and for starting to make up for it now because they have made a number of arrests just in the past few months with regard to the Talents program.

It is my hope that PSI's work has opened the eyes of our government to these systemic problems, and I think that is the case, as what we have seen in the Trump administration is they have taken a firmer stance towards the Chinese Government in every one of the four areas I talked about.

As PSI was nearing the end of its telecom investigation, for example, the responsible Federal agencies announced that they would review whether these Chinese state-owned carriers that we were studying should continue to operate in the U.S., given the national security threats. The Trump administration also recently issued an Executive order to establish Team Telecom as a formal committee, which is a good idea, as well as addressing many of the issues the subcommittee report identified in Team Telecom's processes.

Again, these are good steps, and I am pleased to say that they were prompted by the thorough and, again, objective, nonpartisan inquiry that we made through PSI. These four investigations combined show us that China, frankly—and, again, the Chinese Government and the Chinese Communist Party, not the people of China—is not going to play by the rules unless we require it. Until we start to clean up our own house and take a firmer stance on foreign influence here in this country, we are not going to see much improvement. Rather than pointing the finger at China, we ought to be looking at our own government and our own institutions and doing a better job here.

Along those lines, I found it interesting that, just last week, 54 NIH-funded researchers nationwide have resigned or have been fired because they had been found to be hiding their ties to foreign research institutions as part of an NIH investigation into this problem. Again, after our PSI investigation talking about how the Thousand Talents program and other programs work, there are now 54 people just last week who have been fired or have resigned.

Of the cases NIH has studied, 70 percent of the researchers failed to disclose foreign grant funding, while more than half failed to disclose participation in a foreign talent program like Thousand Talents. By the way, the FBI just recently warned universities across the country that China may be attempting to steal our research on the coronavirus—therapies, antiviral therapies, vaccines, other research. This problem is ongoing.

I think, in a fair and straightforward manner, we have got to insist that

there be a level playing field. We have got to insist that there be fairness and accountability, again, in an objective manner and a straightforward manner.

At the same time, our law enforcement officials and other Federal entities that are working to hold China accountable are limited in the actions they can take. That is part of cleaning up our own house. We need to make some changes around here, including in our laws, which has to come through this body.

In the case of the Thousand Talents plan, we have seen first-ever arrests related to Thousand Talents recently. They followed our investigation, our report, and our hearings. We even saw it in my home State of Ohio. All of the arrests in connection with the Thousand Talents plan, by the way, had been related to peripheral financial crimes, like wire fraud and tax evasion—not the core issue of a conflict of commitment, the taking of American taxpayer-paid research.

Why? Because amazingly, it is not currently a crime to fail to disclose foreign funding of the same research on Federal grant applications. In other words, if you are doing research and paid by the taxpayer of the United States in your research and also being paid by China to do the same research and to have the research go to China, you don't have to disclose that under law.

These arrests that have been made haven't been about that core issue. They have been about other things like tax evasion or wire fraud, kind of like they went after the gangsters in the old days on tax evasion because they couldn't get them on a RICO statute.

We need to change the laws so that we can give our law enforcement community the tools they need to be able to do the job that all of us expect is being done. It is incumbent upon Congress to work in a bipartisan manner to pass those laws and to put a stop to this behavior.

This shouldn't be a partisan issue, and it isn't. It is about defending the interests of the United States, and that is something we should all agree on. The good news is we are starting to do just that. Tomorrow, we plan to introduce bipartisan legislation called the Safeguarding American Innovation Act based on recommendations from our Thousand Talents report from late last year to protect U.S. taxpayer-funded research.

First and foremost, our bill is going to help the Department of Justice go after Thousand Talents participants by holding them accountable for failing to disclose their foreign ties on Federal grant applications. Again, it is a tool that they desperately need. Our bill goes directly to the root of the problem. It makes it punishable by law to knowingly fail to disclose foreign funding on Federal grant applications.

This isn't about more arrests. We should all agree that transparency and honesty on grant applications are crit-

ical to the integrity of U.S. research and the U.S. research enterprise. These provisions will help promote those principles as well.

Our bill also makes other important changes from our report. It requires the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, to streamline and coordinate grant making between the Federal agencies so there is more continuity and accountability in coordination when it comes to tracking the billions of dollars of taxpayer-funded grant money that is being distributed. This kind of transparency is long overdue.

We have worked closely with the National Science Foundation, with the National Institutes of Health, with the Department of Energy, and others on this legislation, and they agree this is very important. Our legislation also allows the State Department to deny visas to foreign researchers who they know are seeking to steal research and intellectual property by exploiting exemptions in our current export control laws.

This may surprise you, but the State Department can't do that now. Career Foreign Service Officers and employees at the State Department have asked us to please provide them this authority. They testified before our hearing, asking us to help them to be able to do what they know needs to be done.

Our bill also requires research institutions and universities to provide the State Department basic information about sensitive technologies that a foreign researcher would have access to. Providing this information as part of the visa process should help streamline the process for the State Department and for the research institutions.

This allows for college campuses to rely on the State Department to do some of the vetting for these applicants and to help keep bad actors off the campus. This is why many research institutions and universities will be endorsing our legislation tomorrow because we have worked with them on this issue and others, including new transparency standards for universities.

They are now going to be required to report any foreign gift of \$50,000 or more, which is a lower level from the current threshold of \$250,000, but it is also going to empower the Department of Education to work with these universities and research institutions to ensure that this can be complied with in a way that doesn't create undue red-tape and expenditures. It also allows DOE to fine universities that repeatedly fail to disclose these gifts.

I believe this legislation can be a model going forward as to how we use the lessons we have learned from these, again, objective and straightforward PSI reports to get to the root causes of these cases. We have gotten widespread support across my home State of Ohio, from research leaders, hospitals, colleges and universities, and other stakeholders who want to see us continue to have an open and transparent research

system and have the United States be the center in the globe for innovation and research, but to ensure that can continue to happen, they want to be sure we are holding China accountable.

We are now at work on this legislation to codify into law some of the steps taken by the Trump administration in response to our new telecommunications PSI report as well. This legislation we will introduce tomorrow will be led by myself and Senator TOM CARPER, my colleague from the other side of the aisle from Delaware, who was also my partner on this report with regard to the Thousand Talents program and the hearing.

We also have five other Democrats who will be joining us tomorrow, all of whom have an interest and understanding of this complicated issue. We will also have about an equal number of Republicans joining us, probably six to eight Republicans. So, again, this is going to be a bipartisan effort—I would say even a nonpartisan effort—to ensure that, in a smart, sensible, practical way, we can respond to the threat that we are facing, in this case, from China taking our intellectual property, our innovations, our ideas, and taking them to China and using them in China, sometimes against the United States.

In addition to the four examples we discussed tonight, the subcommittee will continue its work to shine a light on other examples where China and other countries aren't living by the rules, so we can ensure that, with regard to China and in regard to other foreign governments, we can create a more durable and a more equitable and a more sustainable relationship between our countries.

Again, we don't want to be enemies with China, but what we do want is to have a relationship with mutual respect. When we have the right to ask them that they treat us with the same respect that we treat them, at the end of the day, that is what is going to be best for the Chinese people, best for the American people, and best for all of us moving forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### THE DECLINE OF U.S. LEADERSHIP

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to a letter published by my friend Sir Peter

Westmacott, on the occasion of what would have been the meeting of the G7 at Camp David. Peter is the former U.K. ambassador to the United States and a thoughtful diplomat if there ever was one. He previously served as ambassador to France and ambassador to Turkey. Unburdened by the self-consciousness that sometimes plagues American policymakers critical of the Trump administration, he writes honestly and insightfully to a British Prime Minister of the ways President Trump has weakened America's standing as an international leader and how others stand to capitalize from our diminished role. In the midst of a global pandemic compounded by climate change, multiple armed conflicts and humanitarian crises, Russian aggression and expanding Chinese influence, when global leadership and cooperation are needed more than ever, the incoherence and isolationism of this White House are appalling.

Over many years, I have worked with Senators of both parties, with Republican and Democratic administrations, and with foreign leaders. I disagreed with, as well as those with whom we have much in common. The most successful makers of foreign policy share an adherence to the truth, objectively and uniformly acknowledged; a recognition of the importance of engagement with the rest of the world; and the goal of seeking common ground to make progress on shared interests.

Unfortunately, President Trump fails on each of these counts. As Sir Peter describes, he disregards facts for his preferred fictitious narratives. He turns away from our allies and picks fights with our trading partners. He impulsively withdraws from international agreements that took years to negotiate because he does not stand to benefit personally or politically from them. He has abandoned our role as a moral and strategic leader. He crafts foreign policy by tweet. It is a disgrace, and foreign diplomats and heads of state, with the exception of our adversaries and autocrats who stand to benefit by mimicking President Trump, are confused, worried, and appalled.

Sir Peter aptly describes this sorry state of affairs and what it means for our country and the world.

I ask unanimous consent that Sir Peter Westmacott's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[June 10, 2020]

AN EX-AMBASSADOR'S VIEW OF A WORLD WITHOUT POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

(By Peter Westmacott)

DEAR PRIME MINISTER: This week you should have been meeting up with your G7 colleagues at Camp David. Covid-19 has stopped that happening but there is so much going on that I thought I should send you my briefing note anyway.

President Trump was delighted to be host. He always likes to be centre stage but the

summit would have been a welcome distraction from his slow and confused response to the pandemic and from how, in marked contrast to his predecessor, he made things worse not better when Americans took the streets following the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis. Every judgement he makes from now until 3 November will be viewed through the prism of whether it helps him win a second term.

That is currently looking less likely than before the pandemic. Trump's base is holding up—he has delivered hundreds of conservative judges, sided with white supremacists, stood up for the gun lobby and given tax cuts to the wealthy. His attempts to smear his opponent Joe Biden don't currently seem to be working but much will depend on whether there are signs of an economic bounce-back before election day; and on turn-out, especially in the six critical swing states of Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin where Trump sealed it last time, plus Florida, North Carolina and Arizona. Democrats I talk to currently point to the betting spreads—not just the polls—slightly favouring Biden and dare to hope for a clean sweep of White House and Senate (not even Republicans expect the Democrats to lose the House).

The summit would have taken place against a background of failure of the global institutions, including the G7—to organise a meaningful collective response to the C19 crisis. Everyone knows that the WHO chose to praise rather than lambast China for its performance in the early stages of the outbreak, in the hope of eliciting a more honest and transparent response. But your counterparts are clear that Trump's decision to walk away from the WHO had more to do with pointing the finger of blame before the US elections than with improving our ability to act collectively.

This is symptomatic of a wider problem—the disappearance of US moral and strategic leadership under Trump. The causes are legion: take for example his protectionist focus on 'America First', the trade wars with China and the EU, the undermining of NATO, the renunciation of international arms control agreements, of the Iran nuclear deal, his trashing of the Middle East Peace Process, his vainglorious but failed attempt to denuclearise North Korea, his abandonment of the Paris climate accords, and his unique contribution to the creation of a posttruth world in which the West has largely forfeited the right to call out others for bad behaviour.

Crises accelerate trends more than they create new ones. When Covid-19 hit us, the free world was already rethinking its attitude towards the rise of a China more interested in consolidating the power of the communist party and its leader, Xi Jinping, than in the welfare of its people or engagement with the rest of the world on any other than its own terms.

You will recall coming under heavy US pressure in January to exclude Huawei from Britain's 5G telecoms infrastructure. Allies and friends in South East Asia were already very exercised about China's militarisation programme and disregard of the findings of the UN Law of the Sea Convention rejecting its territorial claims. Taiwan was feeling threatened while China's attempt last year to impose an extradition treaty on Hong Kong was a foretaste of its attempt now, under cover of the pandemic crisis, further to undermine "one country, two systems" with new national security laws jeopardising the territory's fundamental freedoms.

Covid-19 has also accelerated the concern of China's trading partners about the resilience of their supply chains. Early in the crisis, Jaguar Land Rover had to halt produc-

tion because of a lack of components made in Wuhan. Companies the world over are now looking again at whether 'just-in-time' deliveries from far away Chinese suppliers need supplementing with 'just-in-case' arrangements nearer home.

Your own launch of Project Defend designed to improve the resilience of strategically important firms is being matched by similar rethinking elsewhere in Europe, where Macron and Merkel have joined forces to press for greater EU sovereignty. That in turn followed the EU's decision last year to designate China as "a systemic rival promoting alternative systems of governance", as concern has grown around China's increasingly apparent agenda of seeing the Western model of individual liberty, freedom of expression and democracy replaced by acceptance of authoritarianism and the party-state.

China likes to pick off individual countries, as we in the UK have seen in the past. After Australia called for an independent investigation of the Covid-19 outbreak, China imposed an 80% tariff on its imports of Australian barley. So it will be important to forge a common approach. It was unfortunate that in March US Secretary of State Pompeo blocked a G-7 statement on the pandemic because other governments would not agree to describing it as "the Wuhan virus". But Dominic Raab's call with the foreign ministers of our Five Eyes intelligence partners on 2 June to discuss Hong Kong was a good start.

As far as possible, however, we should aim to work with rather than against China. It is heavily invested in the global economy and has vast trade surpluses with the rest of the world. It has also begun to move in the right direction on imports and inward investment—if not yet on protection of intellectual property. But as you have made clear with your offer of a path to citizenship for Hong Kong's British passport holders, that cannot be at the cost of surrendering fundamental principles or reneging on our international commitments.

Trump has said he thinks Putin should be invited to the next G7 summit, whenever it takes place. You have said firmly that you don't agree, for the very good reason that there has not been the improvement in Russian behaviour in Ukraine required by the Minsk agreements. Trump is close to Putin, and his business dealings with Russia go back many years. So he may try again, perhaps with the support of Macron who wants to "re-engage" with Russia.

In Putin's playbook, compromise is weakness so you may need to remind your colleagues of his mission to recover the ground he thinks Russia lost in what he has called the "greatest geopolitical disaster of the 20th Century" when the Soviet Union imploded; of Russia's role in systematically undermining elections in free countries; and of the Kremlin's nasty habit of trying to murder its critics and opponents on the streets of British cities.

Your European counterparts are likely to raise their concerns at the current state of Brexit negotiations. They have understood that you won't be asking to extend the transition period beyond the end of the year. They would like a deal to be reached in the remaining six months since they too will be losers if there isn't one. But just as your team argue that the Commission are being unreasonable, and have moved the goalposts, so Barnier & Co think we have changed our position since you concluded the Withdrawal Agreement and political declaration last year and that the bespoke arrangement we are asking for is much more than the simple Canada-style agreement we say we want. Waiting for, or provoking, a breakdown, in

the hope that political leaders will come to the rescue is unlikely to work: we should be preparing for either stop-the-clock at the end of December while a last-minute fudge is worked out, or no deal at all.

Beyond those detailed negotiations lie some big issues related to Britain's place in the world and our global influence. The E3 arrangement between France, Germany and the UK still functions, and is helping to manage the fall-out from Trump's abandonment of the 2015 nuclear deal with Iran. More generally, on many of the big international issues the UK is more naturally aligned these days with its European partners than with the US. But there is still a sense that we currently have little bandwidth or inclination to play the kind of substantive foreign policy role we have played in the past, and disappointment in EU capitals that we don't want to include foreign and security policy in the structure of our new post-Brexit relationship. I would say this, wouldn't I, but we need to guard against the risk that, despite the talk of Global Britain, we find ourselves unable to exercise as much influence outside the EU as we did inside it—a concern shared by foreign policy experts in Washington.

So at some point you might want to consider boosting our soft and hard power alike by bringing together the substantial resources of our defence, international development, international trade and foreign ministries in more joined-up fashion to restore the UK's global credibility, trust and diplomatic clout. Our friends feel we have left the stage and want us back. We have in the past come up with original ideas, built bridges and helped solve problems. We should aspire to do so again.

Yours,

PETER.

#### THE AIR TOUR AND SKYDIVING SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2020

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, in 2019, 21 people died in Hawaii in three tragic air recreation accidents involving helicopters or planes.

On December 26, 2019, while many of us were enjoying the holidays with our loved ones and friends, seven people lost their lives when an air tour helicopter crashed into a mountain on the Island of Kauai. All aboard the helicopter were killed, a mother and daughter from Wisconsin, a family of four from Switzerland, and the pilot. We still do not know the cause of the crash. In April 2019, an air tour helicopter crashed on a street in the residential neighborhood of Kailua on the island of Oahu, killing all aboard: two passengers and the pilot. We were fortunate that no one on the ground was injured. On June 22, 2019, 11 people died when a small plane crashed during take-off on a skydiving trip from Dillingham Airfield on Oahu. In the first accident of 2020, on March 5, six people walked away after a hard landing of an air tour helicopter on the Big Island of Hawaii. No one on the helicopter was seriously injured.

Since 2015, the National Transportation Safety Board, or NTSB, has investigated 10 air tour accidents in Hawaii and more than 46 nationwide.

Senator SCHATZ and I are introducing the Air Tour and Skydiving Safety Im-

provement Act of 2020. The bill takes the outstanding safety issues and recommendations identified by the NTSB to improve the safety and accountability of air sightseeing tours and parachute tours. The Federal Aviation Administration, or FAA, has not implemented the NTSB's recommendations.

In most years, Hawaii welcomes nearly 10 million visitors annually to enjoy everything Hawaii has to offer, from our Aloha spirit displayed by our resident, to the scenic beauty of the State. It is critical that the helicopters and planes taking both visitors and residents sightseeing or parachuting operate as safely as possible.

The NTSB has recommended multiple improvements to the standards covering air tour and parachute operations by the FAA. In the aftermath of the helicopter crash in Kailua and the crash of two chartered floatplanes in Alaska, NTSB Chairman Robert L. Sumwalt said in May 2019: "While these tragic accidents are still under investigation, and no findings or causes have been determined, each crash underscores the urgency of improving the safety of charter flights by implementing existing NTSB safety recommendations." To highlight this urgency, the NTSB put improvements to air tour aircraft on its 2019–2020 Most Wanted List of transportation safety improvements.

Let me describe the provisions of the legislation. First, the bill requires parachute and air tour companies to operate under the same standards as other commercial air operations, such as commuter airlines under Part 135, which has certification standards. Currently, commercial companies can operate like private civil aircraft if they operate within 25 miles of their airport, under regulations found in Part 91. The NTSB recommends that all commercial air operations meet the same standards for training, certification, operations, and crew rest under part 135.

The bill requires that the FAA establish a standard for terrain awareness and warning systems and minimum standards for training pilots to avoid flying into mountains and other terrain. This may have prevented the helicopter crash on Kauai in December 2019, which crashed into the side of a mountain.

Following another NTSB recommendation, the bill requires operators install crash-resistant flight data recording equipment, we can learn more from accidents and to help identify flaws in equipment and improve pilot performance.

The helicopter involved in the December 2019 crash in Kauai lacked flight data monitoring, so inspectors were uncertain of its flight path and performance. The bill requires the FAA to establish and implement a standard for remote monitoring of flight data. It also requires operators to establish a flight data monitoring program to identify changes from normal procedures and other potential safety issues.

The bill includes provisions to make sure that the current and future recommendations of the NTSB are given full consideration by the FAA. It requires the FAA to indicate how their response to NTSB safety recommendations will meet or exceed safety outcomes of the NTSB's recommendations, if the FAA declines to adopt the NTSB recommendations. The bill also directs the U.S. Department of Transportation to include NTSB recommendations on air tours and parachute operations in its annual report on aviation safety.

The safety of parachute operations would be improved by the standards that I have described, but the bill also addresses the unique safety needs of parachute operations. The bill would require the FAA to develop new or revised regulations for parachute operations, including enhanced maintenance and inspection for aircraft and training and recurrent testing requirements for pilots.

The bill we are introducing today would make great improvements to increase the safety of air tours. This is a first step. But this legislation does not address all the issues with air tour helicopters. The issues of noise, frequency, and safety associated with air tour operations in the State of Hawaii have been going on for decades.

In September 2016, at the request of State Representative Onishi, my office requested a meeting for Big Island State legislators with the FAA Honolulu Flight Standards District Office, or FSDO, to address the issue of the helicopter noise for residents in East Hawaii. We learned at this meeting that FAA-FSDO and Hawaii Department of Transportation do not have the authority to address the noise issue raised by the community.

In March 2017, FAA and the National Park Service representatives traveled to Hawaii from their DC headquarters to convene public listening sessions in Honolulu and Hilo, respectively, "to better identify specific concerns with helicopter operations within and outside of national parks." Community members were looking for relief from noise issues associated with air tour overflights over residential areas.

We were hopeful that these meetings were a signal of FAA's engagement so we could address community concerns with the air tour operators. Individuals from the community came prepared and raised questions about how other communities across the country have dealt with this issue including the New York North Shore Helicopter Route and the adjustments to routes over Los Angeles County.

State and local governments, air tour companies, and the community were interested in engaging. Unfortunately, while the FAA initiated the meetings, they disappointed many in our community when they announced that their agency could only offer technical advice and the effort did not result in an air tour safety plan.



In another example of FAA inaction, Congress required the FAA and the National Park Service to develop air tour management plans for our national parks under the Air Tour Management Act of 2000. For two decades, inter-agency fighting prevented any progress from being made. In 2018, the Hawaii Island Malama Pono Coalition and Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, groups representing national park employees and visitors, filed a petition in Federal court to compel the agencies to regulate air tours at seven parks.

On May 1, 2020, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ordered the FAA and the National Park Service to develop air tour management plans for 23 national parks, including Haleakala National Park and Volcanoes National Park in Hawaii. The court found that the agencies' efforts were "underwhelming," "ultimately unsuccessful," and failed to develop the plans in a reasonable amount of time.

The court expects the agencies to develop the air tour management plans for all 23 parks within 2 years, and the court will retain jurisdiction to continue oversight until the agencies have completed the plans.

Volcanoes National Park was the subject of 8,333 air tour flights in 2018, over 22 flights per day, the highest number of air tour flights of any national park. Haleakala had the fourth most air tour flights in 2018, with 4,757 flights. The residents in the surrounding communities in the flight path and visitors trying to enjoy the quiet of nature are all too aware of the visual and the noise from air tour flights.

With the decision by the Court, many in Hawaii now expect action in the development of air tour management plans for Hawaii's two national parks.

Of course, air tours affect residents and communities in Hawaii throughout the State. On January 9 of this year, members of the Hawaii Helicopter Association, Hawaii Department of Transportation's Airports Division, appointees from the State legislature, and other stakeholders formed the Hawaii Air Noise and Safety Task Force with representatives from the FAA as technical advisers. The task force was created to "fund public meetings, produce a study and make recommendations concerning the helicopter and fixed wing tour industry."

It remains clear to me that the FAA needs to address its failure to oversee the air tour industry. On January 31, Senator SCHATZ and I joined in the Senate Commerce Committee's request for an investigation by the inspector general of the Department of Transportation into allegations that the FAA's Honolulu Flight Standards District Office ignored serious concerns about the safety of helicopter air tours in Hawaii. We requested an investigation into the oversight lapses raised by the whistleblowers. The ongoing investigation by

the inspector general will show whether FAA is able to enforce its own rules in Hawaii.

What remains clear is that the NTSB has recommended additional standards to the FAA to improve safety throughout the country, but the FAA has not addressed these safety issues. We have waited long enough for action.

The legislation we are introducing will strengthen the rules to ensure accountability and safety for Hawaii's aviation operators and travelers.

#### FIVE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF CHARLESTON CHURCH SHOOTING

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, 5 years have passed, and it still feels like a bad dream, but we know it actually happened. The senseless murder of nine parishioners at Mother Emanuel hit South Carolina like a ton of bricks. It remains hard to understand how anyone could have so much hate in their heart. To be welcomed into a church, worship with the parishioners, and then turn around and shoot them in cold blood remains one of the most horrific acts ever recorded.

Then just days after this horrible tragedy, the people at Mother Emanuel showed a level of love and forgiveness that was truly unimaginable. It was an act that is rarely seen. I personally cannot imagine turning to the person who killed my family members saying, I forgive you. I know that type of grace can only come from God. Of all the things that I have seen in public life, the words from the family members continue to amaze me to this day. You must truly have the love of the Lord in your heart to be able to muster that kind of forgiveness.

On the 5-year anniversary, we think of those who lost their lives and the families left behind, the Christmases without loved ones, the birthdays missed. Our hearts are still broken, and our prayers remain with the parishioners at Mother Emanuel.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO DR. AMY ACTON

• Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my appreciation for a great Ohioan and public servant, Dr. Amy Acton, for her leadership and expertise while serving as the director of the Ohio Department of Health.

Born and raised in Youngstown, OH, Dr. Acton knew she wanted to be a doctor from a young age. She attended Northeastern Ohio University School of Medicine, studying pediatrics and preventive medicine. Dr. Acton continued her education, earning a master's degree in public health from the Ohio State University, where she went on to teach as an associate professor.

In 2019, Governor Mike DeWine appointed her to lead our State's health department, the first woman to hold the position in Ohio's history.

That job is always critical, public health is one of the most important jobs our government does, and until a few months ago, it was too often underappreciated. But 17 months ago, few could have predicted just how vital Dr. Acton's role would be, as she stepped up to lead Ohio's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. On March 22, 2020, while much of the Nation was still in denial about the quickly evolving pandemic, Dr. Acton led the charge and issued a statewide stay at home order, making Ohio one of the first States to do so. Understanding that the best leaders are open and honest, Dr. Acton participated in the Governor's daily press conferences. She answered questions and helped explain the threat of COVID-19 and the actions her department was taking to keep Ohioans safe through clever analogies, from brewing storms to Swiss cheese.

Throughout the spring, under Dr. Acton's leadership, Ohio continued to lead the country in taking bold action to slow COVID-19's spread. Dr. Acton's early intervention, supported by science and data, saved lives and significantly slowed the spread of the virus in Ohio.

Dr. Acton put the life and well-being of people over politics. She used empathy and honesty to educate, inform, and comfort Ohioans in uncertain times, exceeding the duties expected of her, to ensure the health and safety of her fellow Ohioans.

Thank you, Dr. Acton, for your wisdom, bravery, and compassion throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. Your leadership saved countless lives in Ohio. I am sure my Senate colleagues will join me in thanking Dr. Amy Acton for her exemplary efforts.●

#### 2020 SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTEES FROM UTAH

• Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor 14 exemplary young Utahns who have answered the call of service to our country.

Each year, Members of Congress are authorized to nominate a number of young men and women from their district or State to attend our Nation's service academies: the U.S. Air Force Academy, the U.S. Military Academy, and the U.S. Naval Academy.

The men and women whom I nominated on behalf of the State of Utah this year are some of the best and brightest in our country.

Each of these students is of sound mind and body, which will serve them well in Colorado Springs, West Point, and Annapolis. But the journey on which these young men and women will soon embark demands more than strength of mind and strength of body. It demands strength of character. It requires qualities of leadership, courage, honesty, prudence, and selfdiscipline. It calls for a commitment to service and a love of country. And ultimately, it requires a willingness to give the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of the safety and security of our Nation.



These students have already displayed the qualities of character and the standards of excellence upon which our service academies are built.

Today, I would like to take a moment to honor and congratulate these talented and generous young men and women.

James Soren Beck has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. He is a graduate of Lone Peak High School, where he was captain of the soccer team, a member of the National Honor Society, and CEO of his entrepreneur class. James is an Eagle Scout, a member of the Teenage Republicans, and has been a volunteer to serve veterans at the VA Hospital in Salt Lake City.

Abigail Renee Belko graduated from Saint Joseph Catholic High School and will soon enter the U.S. Naval Academy. She has made it a priority to look for ways to help others and has completed over 100 hours of community service. She served as one of the school's student ambassadors and as a member of the National Honor Society, captained the track team, and played volleyball.

Carson Shaun Cox, from Milford High School, has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. The school's Sterling Scholar in Social Science, Carson also served as a class senator and founded the Tech Theatre club. He attended Boys State and was a captain of the two-time State champion football team and a member of the State champion baseball team.

Alexander Javier Gustat accepted an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. He is a graduate of Juan Diego Catholic High School, where he served as a student ambassador and as a senior class officer. He holds a number of records in swimming and was the 4A state champion in the 100m breaststroke. Alexander was the president of the Pre-Med Club, and a member of both the National Honor Society and the Social Justice Committee.

Lily Faith Hawkins will be joining a family history of military service when she attends the U.S. Air Force Academy after graduating from East High School. She stayed busy as captain of the soccer team, where she was named to the All-State Soccer Team; running track; and playing rugby. She served as a member of the school's senate and participated in the National Honor Society. Lily led her Youthline Humanitarian Team to both Thailand and Fiji, where they served local communities.

Logan Keith Landrum accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy. He knows the Air Force life well as the son of an Academy graduate. Logan graduated from Lake Braddock Secondary School in Fairfax Station, VA, where he was a champion swimmer and captain for multiple school and club swim teams. He participated in both Air Force JROTC and Army JROTC during his high school years and was a member of the JROTC Raiders.

Isaiah Emmanuel Laureano, a member of the Utah Army National Guard, was proud to accept his appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Isaiah worked hard and endured many challenges, which led him to Utah and to the Utah Military Academy, where he graduated as senior class president. He was a member of the National Honor Society, in addition to the cross country team, ranger team, and State champion AFJROTC Drill Team.

Jessica Lynn Loyd, a graduate of the Academy for Math, Engineering and Science, will be attending the U.S. Air Force Academy. A standout athlete and leader, she served as captain of both her school and club swim teams. She carried athletes' voices to the Utah Swimming Board and U.S. Aquatic Sports Convention as the athlete representative. She is a member of the Civil Air Patrol and was an intern with the Salt Lake County's Sheriff's Search and Rescue Team.

Richard Ashton Otley will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. A graduate of the Utah Military Academy—Camp Williams Campus, where he was JROTC Cadet of the Year, he focused on helping his fellow cadets as copresident of the Hope Squad. He volunteered as a tutor and served as captain of both the track and field and rugby teams. He honored our military veterans by volunteering with both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and Wreaths Across America.

Samantha Jimena Padilla will be continuing on to the U.S. Naval Academy after having attended the U.S. Naval Academy Preparatory School. A 2019 graduate of the Utah Military Academy, Samantha played soccer, basketball, ran cross country, and was a Tae Kwon Do instructor. She attended Girls State and was a member of the Civil Air Patrol, as well as the AFJROTC and U.S. Naval Sea Cadets.

Matthew Andrew Sedillo will be attending the U.S. Air Force Academy after graduating in 2019 from Juan Diego Catholic High School and attending the Air Force Academy Preparatory School. In high school, he was a member of the Student Senate and was a Senior Sancta Terra Retreat Leader. He was captain of his high school wrestling team and walked onto the USAFA Prep wrestling team.

Douglas Cutler Smith, II has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. As a graduate of Hillcrest High School, he challenged himself by taking part in the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program. He earned his Eagle Scout Award and served in leadership positions with his church youth group and as captain of both the baseball and football teams.

Brayden Dern Whatcott, a Corner Canyon High School graduate, accepted his appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy, where he is following in his father's footsteps. Brayden was a member of the Draper Youth City Council and attended Boys State. He founded

and served as president of the Civics Club; was a member of the National Honor Society; and a member of Health Occupation Students of America, HOSA. As captain, he led the three-time State champion cross-country mountain biking team.

Tyler Brandon Wright accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy. A graduate of Farmington High School, Tyler served as a student ambassador and was a member of the National Honor Society and Spanish Club. He is an Eagle Scout who is a leader in his church youth council, volunteers as a tutor, and helped build schoolhouses in Peru with HEFY. Tyler serves as a member of the Civil Air Patrol and works with his family on their ranch.

It has been my distinct honor to nominate each of these admirable young men and women. These Utahns give me great hope for the future of our armed services and the future of our Nation.

To these 14 students and to all their future classmates from around the country, I thank you for your commitment to service and commend your achievements. While this is but the beginning of your journey, I urge you to remember the foundation of your success thus far.

You would not have arrived at this point without the dedication and example of your parents, family, teachers, coaches, and mentors. Moreover, you would not have arrived at this point without your own sacrifice and hard work.

Strive to continue on the path of strong moral character, and to keep love of country as a guiding principle. Look to the past with gratitude and to the future with conviction. If you stay this course, I have no doubt that your future holds great things in store.

I wish you all the best as you embark on this journey.

Thank you.●

#### REMEMBERING GLENN DOCKHAM

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Glenn A. Dockham of Milton, VT.

Glenn lived a life of service. He was a Peace Corps volunteer, a U.S. Customs officer, and the president of the National Treasury Employees Union—NTEU—Chapter 142. It was in his capacity as a labor leader that my staff and I had the pleasure of working with Glenn and came to greatly respect his perspective. I am proud to have called on his perspective on a number of occasions to discuss important labor issues. During one occasion, when I organized a panel to discuss labor concerns at the Department of Homeland Security, Glenn provided valuable insights as the voice at the table representing NTEU members. At this time, the Department of Homeland Security was still a relatively new agency, and Glenn helped us to fight for the needs of his members.

I have always considered Glenn a fair and trusted voice in the labor movement and a tireless advocate for Federal employees. I was grateful for his leadership and the commitment that he demonstrated throughout his career. He set an excellent example in his professional life.

In addition to his work, family was very important to Glenn. He leaves behind his wife, Lisa, and his two children, Marcy and Tim. He considered his greatest accomplishment to be raising his children. I have no doubt he set an equally powerful example of hard work, kindness, and service for them and others in his life.

Please join me in honoring the life and legacy of Glenn Dockham.●

#### REMEMBERING MARNY XIONG

● Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, today I would like to acknowledge the life and legacy of Marny Xiong, who had a profound impact on her community and on Minnesota.

Marny Xiong was a fierce advocate for her community and for students. During her career, she worked at Hmong International Academy in Minneapolis prior to serving as an elected leader on the St. Paul Public Schools Board of Education, including as its elected chairwoman. As a proud graduate of St. Paul Public Schools, she was a passionate leader who was dedicated to giving back to her community.

Marny Xiong was also a community organizer. Her vision of equity and racial justice was an inspiration to many, and she dedicated her life to that mission. Marny's fighting spirit showed through her tireless efforts to address the impacts of structural racism. Despite the magnitude of this challenge, she approached her work and her advocacy with joy, an infectious smile, and an enduring sense of hope for making change.

Marny Xiong's lasting impact will continue to be felt by many across the St. Paul community and the State of Minnesota, and I am proud to recognize and celebrate her legacy today.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3985. A bill to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4827. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, a request relative to issuing a travel restriction on senior officials' travel to Afghanistan effective June 15, 2020 through September 30, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4828. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluic acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 10007-74-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4829. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Permissible Interest on Loans that are Sold, Assigned, or Otherwise Transferred" (RIN1557-AE73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4830. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Liquidity Coverage Ratio Rule: Treatment of Certain Emergency Facilities" (RIN1557-AE92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4831. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Director, Shareholder, and Member Meetings: Technical Correction" (RIN1557-AE94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4832. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Paycheck Protection Program Lending Facility and Paycheck Protection Program Loans" (RIN1557-AE90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4833. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Temporary Exclusion of U.S. Treasury Securities and Deposits at Federal Reserve Banks from the Supplementary Leverage Ratio for Depository Institutions" (RIN1557-AE85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4834. A communication from the Congressional Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Total Loss-Absorbing Capacity, Long-Term Debt, and Clean Holding Company Require-

ments for Systemically Important U.S. Bank Holding Companies and Intermediate Holding Companies of Systemically Important Foreign Banking Organizations; Eligible Retained Income; Interim Final Rule" (RIN7100-AF80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4835. A communication from the Congressional Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations Q, Y, and YY: Amendments to the Regulatory Capital, Capital Plan, and Stress Test Rules" (RIN7100-AF02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4836. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interagency Policy Statement on Allowances for Credit Losses" (RIN3133-AF05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4837. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interagency Guidance on Credit Risk Review Systems" (RIN3133-AF05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4838. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4839. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alaska; Hunting and Trapping in National Preserves" (RIN1024-AE38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4840. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Enforcement, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.142, Safety Related Structures for Nuclear Power Plants (Other than Reactor Vessels and Containments)" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4841. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modernizing Ignitable Liquids Determinations" (FRL No. 10006-71-OLEM) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4842. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Maine: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL No. 10010-59-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4843. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Finding of Failure to Attain the 1987,

24-Hour PM10 Standard; Reclassification as Serious Nonattainment; Pinal County, Arizona" (FRL No. 10010-56-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4844. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Plywood and Composite Wood Products Residual Risk and Technology Review" (FRL No. 10009-65-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4845. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Uniform National Discharge Standards for Vessels of the Armed Forces - Phase II - Batch Two (UNDS)" (FRL No. 10009-46-OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4846. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beginning of Construction for Sections 45 and 48" (Notice 2020-41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4847. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "June 2020 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4848. A communication from the Deputy Director, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System" (RIN0970-AC72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4849. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Contract Year 2021 Policy and Technical Changes to the Medicare Advantage Program, Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit Program, and Medicare Cost Plan Program (CMS-4190-F)" (RIN0938-AT97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4850. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval Tests and Standards for Air-Purifying Particulate Respirators" (RIN0920-AA69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4851. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Control of Communicable Diseases; Foreign Quarantine: Suspension of Introduction of Persons into United States from Designated Foreign Countries or Places for Public Health Purposes" (RIN0920-AA76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4852. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge

Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2019, through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4853. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anchorage Grounds; Lower Chesapeake Bay, Cape Charles, Virginia" ((RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2015-1118)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4854. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of State and Local Governments Obligation to Approve Certain Wireless Facility Modification Requests Under Section 6409(a) of the Spectrum Act of 2012, Declaratory Ruling and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" ((FCC 20-75) (WT Docket No. 19-250)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4855. A communication from the Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promoting Broadcast Internet Innovation through ATSC 3.0" (MB Docket No. 20-145) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUBIO, from the Select Committee on Intelligence:

Report to accompany S. 3905, An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-233).

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 3971. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to make modifications to the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 3972. A bill to provide that the unused balance of a dependent care flexible spending arrangement at the end of plan year 2020 may be rolled over to the following plan year; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3973. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of

such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3974. A bill to require certain helicopters to be equipped with safety technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3975. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to provide for whistleblower incentives and protection; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3976. A bill to amend the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Lead Exposure Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 3977. A bill to require the Department of State to publish a list of countries that contract with the Government of Cuba for their medical missions program and ensure that such contracts are considered as factors in considering Trafficking in Persons report rankings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER:

S. 3978. A bill to require the United States Trade Representative to submit a report on plans to facilitate the full implementation of agreements of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3979. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to temporarily waive cost-sharing amounts under the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program during certain declared emergencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER:

S. 3980. A bill to prioritize the purchase of agricultural commodities from domestically owned enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3981. A bill to extend to the Mayor of the District of Columbia the same authority over the National Guard of the District of Columbia as the Governors of the several States exercise over the National Guard of those States with respect to administration of the National Guard and its use to respond to natural disasters and other civil disturbances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3982. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to repeal the authority of the President to assume emergency control of the police of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRAUN, and Mrs. LOEFFLER):

S. 3983. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide accountability

for bad actors who abuse the Good Samaritan protections provided under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3984. A bill to provide that payments for waste and recycling collection services are allowable expenses under the paycheck protection program and eligible for loan forgiveness under the CARES Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SASSE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3985. A bill to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency; read the first time.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3986. A bill to approve certain advanced biofuel registrations, to require the consideration of certain advanced biofuel pathways, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3987. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that COPS grant funds may be used for local law enforcement recruits to attend schools or academics if the recruits agree to serve in precincts of law enforcement agencies in their communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3988. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to telehealth enhancements for emergency response; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 3989. A bill to amend the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 to modify certain membership and other requirements of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 3990. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to make the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection an independent Financial Product Safety Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3991. A bill to establish a special enrollment period for health plans offered on the Exchanges, in response to the public health emergency related to the coronavirus 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3992. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that certain chambers of commerce and destination marketing organizations are eligible for loans under the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3993. A bill to permit a licensed health care provider to provide health care services to individuals in one or more States in which the provider is not licensed; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. SMITH, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. STABENOW, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 625. A resolution encouraging the Government and the people of the United States to "Buy American"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 626. A resolution upholding the civil liberties and civil rights of Iranian Americans and condemning bigotry, violence, and discrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KING, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. Res. 627. A resolution recognizing June 2020 as "LGBTQ Pride Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 578

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 1971

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1971, a bill to require auto dealers to fix outstanding safety

recalls before selling, leasing, or loaning a used motor vehicle.

S. 2235

At the request of Mr. BROWN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to discharge the qualified loan amounts of each individual, and for other purposes.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2539, a bill to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 2602

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2602, a bill to exclude vehicles to be used solely for competition from certain provisions of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2875

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2875, a bill to amend the Smith River National Recreation Area Act to include certain additions to the Smith River National Recreation Area, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain wild rivers in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

S. 3064

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 3064, a bill to oppose violations of religious freedom in Ukraine by Russia and armed groups commanded by Russia.

S. 3103

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3103, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore State authority to waive for certain facilities the 35-mile rule for designating critical access hospitals under the Medicare program.

S. 3176

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3176, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 3393

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3393, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retired pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of

service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

S. 3479

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3479, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to encourage the planting of cover crops following prevented planting, and for other purposes.

S. 3628

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3628, a bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for purchasing dogs and cats from wet markets in China, and for other purposes.

S. 3650

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3650, a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to deem employees of urban Indian organizations as part of the Public Health Service for certain purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 3775

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3775, a bill to establish a United States-Israel Operations-Technology Working Group, and for other purposes.

S. 3865

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3865, a bill to provide for the treatment of certain criminal violations under the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes.

S. 3876

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3876, a bill to make a technical correction relating to the treatment of refunds of merchandise processing fees under the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act.

S. 3893

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3893, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to allow for emergency use of certain land during a pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 3926

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3926, a bill to amend the FAST Act to improve the Federal permitting process, and for other purposes.

S. 3927

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3927, a bill to establish a 90-day limit to file a petition for judicial review of a permit, license, or approval for a highway or public transportation project, and for other purposes.

S. 3955

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3955, a bill to prohibit no-knock warrants, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 509

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 509, a resolution calling upon the United Nations Security Council to adopt a resolution on Iran that extends the dates by which Annex B restrictions under Resolution 2231 are currently set to expire.

S. RES. 623

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 623, a resolution commemorating Otto Frederick Warmbier and condemning the North Korean regime for their continued human rights abuses.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3986. A bill to approve certain advanced biofuel registrations, to require the consideration of certain advanced biofuel pathways, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3986

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF ADVANCED BIOFUEL REGISTRATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPLICATION.—The term “application” means an application for registration under section 80.1450 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 17, 2020)—

(A) that was submitted for approval before June 17, 2020;

(B) for which not less than 180 days have elapsed since the date on which application was submitted for approval; and

(C) that has not been denied by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this Act as the “Administrator”) before June 17, 2020.

(2) TRANSPORTATION FUEL.—The term “transportation fuel” has the meaning given the term in section 211(o)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)).

(b) ACTION ON APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of carrying out the Renewable Fuel Program under section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) (referred to in this Act as the “Renewable Fuel Program”), an application shall be considered approved if not less than 1 State has approved the sale of fuel produced using the processes described in the application under a program designed to reduce the carbon intensity of transportation fuel.

(2) FINAL ACTION ON CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—For the purposes of carrying out the Renewable Fuel Program, in a case in which no State has approved the sale of fuel produced using the processes described in the application under a program designed to reduce the carbon intensity of transportation fuel, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall take final action on the application.

### SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT FOR ACTION ON PENDING ADVANCED BIOFUEL PATHWAYS.

For purposes of carrying out the Renewable Fuel Program, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall take final action on a petition for a renewable fuel pathway under section 80.1416 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 17, 2020), if—

(1) the petition was submitted for approval and deemed complete in accordance with section 80.1416 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 17, 2020), before June 17, 2020; and

(2) not less than 180 days have elapsed since the date on which the petition was submitted for approval and deemed complete in accordance with section 80.1416 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 17, 2020).

### SEC. 3. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Administrator to carry out this Act \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(b) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Administrator shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this Act the funds transferred under subsection (a), without further appropriation.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 625—ENCOURAGING THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES TO “BUY AMERICAN”

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. SMITH, Mr. PETERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 625

Whereas, on July 15, 2019, President Donald J. Trump signed Executive Order 13881 titled

“Maximizing Use of American-Made Goods, Products, and Materials” (84 Fed. Reg. 34257), which would enforce the Buy American Act of 1933 (41 U.S.C. 8301 et seq.) to the greatest extent permitted by law;

Whereas American-made products are developed under strict regulations and undergo testing to ensure their compliance with the highest safety standards;

Whereas American-made products are produced by workers under a regulatory framework that supports fair wages and safe working conditions;

Whereas purchasing American-made products not only bolsters American manufacturing, it also supports communities and families throughout the United States;

Whereas, according to the Manufacturing Institute, each dollar spent in sales of manufactured products supports \$1.33 in output from other sectors of the economy;

Whereas, according to a 2019 report by the Economic Policy Institute titled “Updated employment multipliers for the U.S. economy”, every direct durable manufacturing job supports more than 7 indirect jobs in other areas of the economy, and every direct nondurable manufacturing job supports more than 5 indirect jobs in the economy;

Whereas, according to a 2017 poll conducted by Reuters and Ipsos, when buying products, nearly 70 percent of Americans find it important that the products they buy were made in the United States;

Whereas strengthening American manufacturing improves both the quantity and the quality of employment in the United States, produces innovation and the seeds for future industries, and supports the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas a strong American manufacturing base is essential to both a healthy economy and to revitalizing the United States economy as it recovers from the global COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas a strong domestic supply chain is critical to national security and public safety;

Whereas the global COVID-19 pandemic presented significant challenges for the globally interconnected supply chain of medical products and has heightened the need for supply chain security of a variety of critical materials and products;

Whereas the United States should strengthen and diversify the security of critical supply chains by prioritizing American manufacturing and production, and when necessary work closely with trusted allied nations to ensure global cooperation in times of need; and

Whereas, regarding the manufacturing of critical medical supplies and products essential to national security, the United States must decrease its dependence on foreign nations and boost domestic manufacturing to increase the national stock piles to ensure the United States has a healthy domestic industrial base that can handle any future surge in need for these supplies: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That—*

(1) it is the policy of the United States to “Buy American”;

(2) the Senate supports American manufacturing and strengthening our American manufacturing base; and

(3) the Senate encourages Americans to “Buy American” products and materials to the greatest extent possible.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 626—UPHOLDING THE CIVIL LIBERTIES AND CIVIL RIGHTS OF IRANIAN AMERICANS AND CONDEMNING BIGOTRY, VIOLENCE, AND DISCRIMINATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 626

Whereas Iranian Americans serve as government officials, in the military, and in law enforcement, working to uphold the Constitution of the United States and to protect all Americans;

Whereas Iranian Americans uphold democratic values and believe in the pillars of America—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;

Whereas Iranian Americans are vibrant, peaceful, and law-abiding citizens of the Baha’i, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and Zoroastrian faiths, or are nonreligious;

Whereas Iranian Americans have contributed greatly to the social and economic fabric of American society;

Whereas the Small Business Administration finds Iranian Americans among the immigrant groups with the highest rates of business ownership in the United States;

Whereas Iranian Americans are award-winning artists, scientists, and athletes;

Whereas the United States condemns acts of bigotry, violence, and discrimination;

Whereas dozens of Americans of Iranian heritage were detained for several hours at the Peace Arch Border in Washington State in January 2020 based on their ethnicity or national origin;

Whereas a directive was published appearing to show that the Seattle Field Office directed border patrol agents to target Iranian, Lebanese, and Palestinian nationals born between 1961 and 2001 for additional vetting;

Whereas Customs and Border Protection in the Department of Homeland Security initially denied that there was any directive ordering the detainment of Iranian Americans;

Whereas many Iranian Americans have been deeply shaken by this discriminatory treatment, with some members of the community stating that they will not travel outside of the country for fear of being unfairly targeted based on their national heritage;

Whereas the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in the Department of Homeland Security has opened an investigation into the detention of Iranian Americans at the border;

Whereas the United States Commission on Civil Rights, established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, said that it “expresses deep concern over the treatment of Iranians and Iranian Americans in airports, and calls on the Department of Homeland Security to take all necessary steps immediately to ensure equitable treatment of all people at America’s borders”;

Whereas according to a survey commissioned by the Public Affairs Alliance of Iranian Americans, the percentage of Iranian Americans who say they have personally experienced discrimination because of their ethnicity or national origin was 49 percent in 2018;

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s 2019 Hate Crime Statistics reveals that the most common bias motivation of single-bias incidents is due to race, ethnicity, or ancestry bias at 59.6 percent of all incidents; and

Whereas Iranian Americans have long faced discrimination in times of turbulence

in the relationship between the United States and Iran: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the Senate—*

(1) condemns bigotry and acts of violence or discrimination against any American, including Iranian Americans;

(2) declares that government leaders and law enforcement personnel should ensure that the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans, including Iranian Americans, are fully protected;

(3) encourages local, State, and Federal elected officials to engage Iranian Americans to share their experiences with their communities to end stereotypes, correct misconceptions, and convey instances of abuse against the Iranian American community;

(4) calls upon local, State, and Federal law enforcement authorities to investigate and vigorously prosecute crimes committed against all Americans, including Iranian Americans, that are based on actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, or ethnicity;

(5) urges the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in the Department of Homeland Security to conclude a thorough and timely investigation into detentions of Iranian Americans at the border; and

(6) calls on Customs and Border Protection in the Department of Homeland Security to halt immediately any orders that encourage discrimination on the basis of nationality or religion, including those targeting individuals of Iranian heritage.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 627—RECOGNIZING JUNE 2020 AS “LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH”

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KING, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 627

Whereas individuals who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this preamble as “LGBTQ”) include individuals from—

(1) all States, territories, and the District of Columbia; and

(2) all faiths, races, national origins, socioeconomic statuses, education levels, and political beliefs;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have made, and continue to make, vital contributions to the United States and to the world in every aspect, including in the fields of education, law, health, business, science, research, economic development, architecture, fashion, sports, government, music, film, politics, technology, literature, and civil rights;

Whereas the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (referred to in this preamble as “COVID-19”) pandemic compounds the systemic inequality that LGBTQ people face in the



healthcare, employment, and housing systems in the United States, leading to a disparate impact on LGBTQ people;

Whereas the persistent failure of Federal and State officials to collect full and accurate data on sexual orientation and gender identity, particularly in the current COVID-19 pandemic, causes tremendous harm to LGBTQ people in the United States, who remain largely invisible to the government entities entrusted with ensuring their health, safety, and well-being;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve on the front lines during the COVID-19 pandemic as doctors, nurses, medical professionals, law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders in all States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve, and have served, the United States Army, Coast Guard, Navy, Air Force, and Marines honorably and with distinction and bravery;

Whereas an estimated number of more than 100,000 brave service members were discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States between the beginning of World War II and 2011 because of their sexual orientation, including the discharge of more than 13,000 service members under the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy in place between 1994 and 2011;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve, and have served, in positions in the Federal Government and State and local governments, including as members of Congress, Governors, mayors, and city council members;

Whereas the demonstrators who protested on June 28, 1969, following a law enforcement raid of the Stonewall Inn, an LGBTQ club in New York City, are pioneers of the LGBTQ movement for equality;

Whereas, throughout much of the history of the United States, same-sex relationships were criminalized in many States and many LGBTQ people in the United States were forced to hide their LGBTQ identities while living in secrecy and fear;

Whereas, on June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 135 S. Ct. 2584, that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry and acknowledged that “[n]o union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family.”;

Whereas Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (referred to in this preamble as “AIDS”) has disproportionately impacted LGBTQ people in the United States, due in part to a lack of funding and research devoted to finding effective treatment for AIDS and the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (referred to in this preamble as “HIV”) during the early stages of the HIV and AIDS epidemic;

Whereas gay and bisexual men and transgender women of color have a higher risk of contracting HIV;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has maintained its unwavering commitment to ending the HIV and AIDS epidemics;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States face disparities in employment, healthcare, education, housing, and many other areas central to the pursuit of happiness in the United States;

Whereas 28 States have no explicit ban on discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in the workplace, housing, or public accommodations, and 34 States have no explicit ban on discrimination against LGBTQ individuals in education;

Whereas LGBTQ youth are at increased risk of—

- (1) suicide;
- (2) homelessness;

(3) becoming victims of bullying, violence, and human trafficking; and

(4) developing mental health illnesses, including anxiety and depression;

Whereas only 13 States and the District of Columbia have explicit policies in place to protect foster youth from discrimination based on both sexual orientation and gender identity;

Whereas LGBTQ youth of color are over-represented in child welfare and juvenile justice systems;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has faced discrimination, inequality, and violence throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States, in particular transgender individuals, face a disproportionately high risk of becoming victims of violent hate crimes;

Whereas members of the LGBTQ community have been targeted in acts of mass violence, including—

(1) the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida, on June 12, 2016, where 49 people were killed; and

(2) the arson attack at the UpStairs Lounge in New Orleans, Louisiana, on June 24, 1973, where 32 people died;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States face persecution, violence, and death in many parts of the world, including State-sponsored violence;

Whereas in the several years preceding 2019, hundreds of LGBTQ people around the world were arrested and, in some cases, tortured or even executed, because of their actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in countries and territories such as Chechnya, Egypt, Indonesia, and Tanzania;

Whereas, in May 2019, Taiwan became the first place in Asia to extend marriage rights to same-sex couples;

Whereas, since June 2019, Ecuador, Northern Ireland, and Costa Rica have extended marriage rights to same-sex couples, the most recent country-wide extensions of those rights in the world;

Whereas policies such as the Migrant Protection Protocol and safe third country agreements with the countries of the Northern Triangle of Central America force LGBTQ asylum seekers to remain in dangerous conditions without adequate protections;

Whereas the LGBTQ community holds Pride festivals and marches in some of the most dangerous places in the world, despite threats of violence and arrest;

Whereas, in 2009, President Barack Obama signed the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act (division E of Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2835) into law to protect all people in the United States from crimes motivated by the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of an individual;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have fought for equal treatment, dignity, and respect;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have achieved significant milestones, ensuring that future generations of LGBTQ people in the United States will enjoy a more equal and just society;

Whereas, despite being marginalized throughout the history of the United States, LGBTQ people in the United States continue to celebrate their identities, love, and contributions to the United States in various expressions of Pride;

Whereas Pride is a celebration of visibility in spite of marginalization, and the LGBTQ community will continue to observe this significant cultural practice even though physical Pride celebrations may be compromised in June 2020 due to the health and safety needs of all individuals involved;

Whereas, in June 2020, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that existing civil rights laws prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, a landmark victory for the LGBTQ community; and

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States remain determined to pursue full equality, respect, and inclusion for all individuals regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the rights, freedoms, and equal treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this resolution as “LGBTQ”) people in the United States and around the world;

(2) acknowledges that LGBTQ rights are human rights that are to be protected by the laws of the United States and numerous international treaties and conventions;

(3) supports efforts to ensure the equal treatment of all people in the United States, regardless of sexual orientation and gender identity;

(4) supports efforts to ensure that the United States remains a beacon of hope for the equal treatment of people around the world, including LGBTQ individuals; and

(5) encourages the celebration of June as “LGBTQ Pride Month” in order to provide a lasting opportunity for all people in the United States—

(A) to learn about the discrimination and inequality that the LGBTQ community endured, and continues to endure; and

(B) to celebrate the contributions of the LGBTQ community throughout the history of the United States.

## NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to S. Res. 625, a resolution entitled Encouraging the Government and the people of the United States to “Buy American” and for other purposes, dated June 17, 2020 for the reasons as stated in the RECORD.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have notified the Senate majority leader of my intent to object to proceeding to S. Res. 625, a resolution encouraging the Government and the people of the United States to “Buy American.” The resolution, though well-intentioned, would have implications on trade and manufacturing policy that require further study. It could further invite our trading partners to take similar actions that would negatively impact U.S. farmers, businesses, consumers, and workers.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND  
TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC  
WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 17, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 17, 2020, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 17, 2020, at 4:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 17, 2020, at 4:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,  
AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 17, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 17, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 17, 2020, at 12 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST  
TIME—S. 3985

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3985) to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro

tempore, upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 105-292, as amended by Public Law 106-55, Public Law 107-228, and Public Law 112-75, appoints the following individual to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom: Reverend Frederick A. Davie of New York.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 18,  
2020

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, June 18; further, that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Walker nomination; finally, notwithstanding rule XXII, postclosure time on the Walker nomination expire at 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.

NOMINATION OF JUSTIN REED  
WALKER

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the nomination of Justin Walker to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, but let's start with Conner Curran. Justin Walker actually has met Conner—not really, but I introduced him to Conner through this picture during his nomination hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

Several years ago, Conner was diagnosed with Duchenne muscular dystrophy, a degenerative life-threatening disease which presently has no cure. Most people who have the disease die by their mid-20s. Conner was diagnosed at age 5. I met Conner a couple of years later. There is probably nobody who has inspired me more with his courage, his energy, his strength of character than Conner Curran and his wonderful family who live in Ridgefield, CT.

His parents were told, at the time of his diagnosis, that this beautiful young sweet child would slowly lose his ability to run, lift his arms, hug them, and he would need complex care for the rest of his life. He would need multiple specialists that would cost tens of thousands of dollars each year, which they

could not afford. But they made it possible or, actually, it was made possible by the Affordable Care Act. Now, because of that act, he cannot be denied care. He is alive. He is not giving up. He is fighting for both a cure and the Affordable Care Act.

He is not the only one. There are 1.5 million people in the State of Connecticut alone and millions more around the country living with preexisting conditions. There are 182,000 children among those 1.5 million people, just like Conner, living with the potentially debilitating and even deadly effects of preexisting conditions, and there are millions more around the country. For them, for Americans, the Affordable Care Act is more than a law; it is a lifeline. Each of them can get the affordable care they need because of that lifeline.

Right now, we all know that healthcare has never been more important. We talk about it every day. We are full of rhetoric on the floor of this Chamber about the healthcare crisis, which has precipitated an economic crisis and about the disproportionate effects of that healthcare crisis—a pandemic of an insidious, deadly disease on poor and, often, communities of color.

At the time of this crisis, the President of the United States has nominated Justin Walker to be an appellate judge, a present district court judge who has said that his main mission is to destroy the Affordable Care Act. Of course, that is perfectly consistent with the Trump administration's view of the Affordable Care Act. It is litigating in court right now against the Affordable Care Act. President Trump has opposed it consistently, constantly, vociferously.

Justin Walker, at his investiture as a district court judge, pledged that he would continue to make destruction of the Affordable Care Act a priority. During his investiture remarks, attended by his mentor, the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, he said:

[A]lthough my legal principles are prevalent, they have not yet prevailed. . . . [A]lthough we are winning, we have not won. . . . [A]lthough we celebrate today, we cannot take for granted tomorrow or we will lose our courts and our country.

That wasn't some law review article that Justin Walker wrote back when he was going to school. It wasn't some speech that he made to a local chamber of commerce. It was literally at his swearing in as a U.S. district court judge for the Western District of Kentucky just months ago, not even a year. He said: "[A]lthough my legal principles are prevalent, they have not yet prevailed." If there were a new meaning to give to the word "irony," this nomination would exemplify it.

During a public health crisis, the President of the United States has nominated someone who wants to take healthcare away from people and deny them health insurance.

The reason Conner is here is really to show that these big principles have real-life consequences. Judges have impact. The law matters. Words matter.

[A]lthough my legal principles are prevalent, they have not yet prevailed. . . . [A]lthough we are winning, we have not yet won.

What does a Justin Walker win look like? For those millions of Americans suffering from preexisting conditions, it means denial of healthcare. And for Conner Curran and his family, it could, in effect, be a death sentence.

That may sound like an exaggeration, but it isn't to those millions of Americans who have preexisting conditions. It isn't to Conner and to his family. They live with the real-life consequences of laws that we make and decisions by the courts that may strike down those laws, like the Affordable Care Act.

The irony here is more than abstract. The outrage here should be real. Justin Walker, very simply, is unfit to be a judge on the Court of Appeals. He was judged “unqualified” to be a district court judge.

I ask my colleagues to reject his nomination.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 AM TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:27 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 18, 2020, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be major*

ADAM R. GOLDEN

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

##### *To be major*

JAMES M. CALDWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be major*

NATHANIEL S. SANDERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

##### *To be lieutenant colonel*

IVAN ARREGUIN  
CHARLES K. BANKS  
DEBORAH A. BROWN  
SIMON J. CHANG  
TERRY D. COBBAN, JR.  
MARSHALL A. COEN  
BERNARD CORNELL  
CHAD B. DAVIS  
MICHAEL A. DERENZIO  
ARCHIE N. DURHAM  
WILLIAM I. HARRISON  
REGINO R. HERNANDEZ  
DANIEL D. KANG  
STUART D. KAZAROVICH  
JONATHAN J. KNOEDLER  
LINDA LESSANE  
KENNETH S. LEWIS  
PATRICK I. LOWTHIAN  
WILLIAM A. MARTIN

KARLYN K. MASCHHOFF  
NATHAN P. MCLEAN  
JEFFREY S. MITCHELL  
TROY A. MORKEN  
JOSEPH R. ODELL  
GEORGE L. OKOTH  
RALPH L. B. PRICE  
CHRISTOPHER S. RUSACK  
JOHN E. SCOTT  
GERALD A. SHERBOURNE  
LIGHT K. SHIN  
LEONARD R. SIEMS  
KURT W. SPOND  
MATTHEW W. SPRECHER  
JOHN C. VERDUGO  
DAVID L. WARD  
BARRON K. WESTER  
GERALD W. WOODFORD, JR.  
SHAY L. D. WORTHY  
DOUGLAS A. YATES  
CHEUN S. YOO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be lieutenant colonel*

JAMES C. BIRK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

##### *To be lieutenant colonel*

D013487

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

##### *To be major*

JEREMY J. MANDIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

##### *To be major*

YUSEF H. ABUHAKMEH  
STEPHANIE E. ADAMCHAK  
MICHAEL T. AGUILAR  
RYAN R. AKRAMI  
NOFISAT O. ALMAROOF  
ANDREW S. ANDERSON  
JAMES E. ANDREWS II  
ALEXANDER P. ANGELIDIS  
CYRUS A. ASKIN  
MATTI P. ASUMA  
ANNE R. ATALIG  
JUSTIN A. BACON  
SUNG S. BAEK  
AUSTIN T. BAILEY  
KATHERINE M. BAKER  
FELICIA L. BALZANO  
LORAINÉ BALAKI  
ALEXANDER F. BARBUTO  
JASON M. BARNES  
SHANE L. BARNEY  
KYLE D. BARTOL  
JOHN B. BASS  
ELIOT A. BASSETT  
CHRISTOPHER D. BAZEMORE  
KATIE L. BEAUREGARD  
BRIANA E. BEGHLY  
LEONID A. BELYAYEV  
SALVATORE M. BERTUCCI  
GRIFFIN M. BIEDRON  
MICHAEL A. BLEYBERG  
TIMOTHY C. BLOOD  
MICHAEL A. BOEHLER  
JEFFREY M. BOLSTRIDGE  
WHITNEY B. BOND  
MICHAEL B. BOWES  
PAUL C. BRICKER  
KATHERINE R. BRICKNER  
JACOB M. BRIGHT  
CEDRIC L. BUCKLEY  
JAMES M. BURGESS  
ADAM M. BURKETT  
SAMUEL H. BURNS  
MICHAEL F. BUZZARD  
ERIN C. CADDELL  
RIAN C. CALO  
CURT R. CANINE  
CHRISTINE C. CARROLL  
BRENNAN R. CEBULA  
LAURA A. CHACHULA  
JUSTIN D. CHALTRY  
ANDREW C. CHAN  
STEPHEN CHAN  
WILLIAM W. Y. CHANG  
JOHN F. CHAVES  
CHARLES K. CHILDERS  
JOSEPH H. CHIN  
JOAN C. CHOI  
BENJAMIN C. CLARK  
ZACHARIAH Q. CLARK  
DONALD F. COLANTONIO  
DANIEL E. COMERCI  
ERIN M. CONNOR  
DAVID L. COOK  
MATTHEW R. COOPER  
KYLE S. COUPERUS  
JOHN W. CRUZ  
KYLE L. CYR

JOSHUA A. DAVIS  
JAMES B. DEAL, JR.  
CAITLYN B. DEKANTER  
ADAM L. DELGADO  
DANIEL H. DESMOND  
ROBERT W. DESPAIN  
FRANK T. DICKER  
JOSHUA C. DILDAY  
CHRISTOPHER J. DIRE  
ADRIEL G. DIZON  
WOO S. DO  
SAMUEL P. DOUGLASS  
AUSTIN K. DRAKE  
NICHOLAS J. DRAYER  
CHRISTOPHER C. DRESCHER  
DAVID T. DULANEY  
SARA L. ELLING  
AUSTIN C. ELLYSON  
CHRISTOPHER P. ERDMAN  
MATTHEW T. ESPOSITO  
KATHRYN T. FEKETE  
JILLIAN M. FINDLAY  
REMIGIO J. FLOR  
BENJAMIN M. FORSTER  
DOMINIC M. FORTE  
DANIEL J. FRASCA  
DONALD R. FREDERICKS, JR.  
CHRISTIAN P. GAGE  
MICHELLE L. GAINTRY  
MEGAN B. GARCIA  
SHAYAN A. GATES  
ARIEL B. GELMAN  
PETER J. GERTONSON  
PAUL A. GONZALEZ  
SARAH E. GONZALEZ  
NATHANIEL T. GORDON  
JAMES I. GRAGG  
CAITLIN M. GRANADILLOS  
MATTHEW D. GRANT  
CHARLES G. GRAVES IV  
JOHN T. GREEN  
BRENT T. GRIFFIN  
MATTHEW S. GRIFFITH  
ROBERT M. GUIDO  
ANNE E. GUNTER  
CORDELL R. HACHINSKY  
BARRET J. HALGAS  
THOMAS P. HAMILTON  
SARAH L. HANSON  
GARRETT B. HARDY  
TESS A. HARMON  
DANNY G. HARRIS  
MITCHELL C. HARRIS  
WILLIAM R. HAYMAN  
JACOB L. HEATH  
JOHN D. HEETHCOTE  
PAUL J. HEESE  
CORBIN A. HELLS  
ADAM C. HENDERSON  
ERIC O. HEPFNER  
ALEXANDRIA M. HERTZ  
JOSEPH M. HIBBERT  
JAREMY J. HILL  
ADRIAN P. HINTON  
MICHAEL K. HIRATA  
ROBERT T. HOARD  
WILLIAM G. HOLDER  
SAMUEL W. HOPPE  
CHRISTIAN L. HORN  
JARED W. HORNBERGER  
TIMOTHY J. HORRELL  
BIANCA J. HOWARD  
ALBERT HSU  
POWEN HSUEH  
ROSS J. HUMES  
JOHN J. HUSSELL  
CHARLES R. HUTCHINSON  
CHRISTOPHER P. IRWIN  
KRISTINE L. JEFFERS  
JOSEF B. JESSOP  
JONATHAN P. JETER  
ZACKARY A. JOHNSON  
KATHERINE E. JONES  
TRAVIS W. JONES  
ALEXANDER M. KAPLAN  
JOHN M. KEPPLEY  
JACQUELINE Y. KIKUCHI  
JAMES J. KIM  
KATE L. KIMES  
ALEX Y. KOO  
YOSEPH A. KRAM  
CHRISTIAAN F. KROESEN  
SABRINA E. KUNCIV  
DAVID P. LACHANCE  
JOSHUA R. LADNER  
NICOLE R. LAFERRIERE  
DEVIN H. LARSEN  
WILLIAM B. LASSITER  
ROBERT T. LAWRENCE  
KOREY A. LEAFBLAD  
ERIC A. LEE  
JOHN W. LEE  
JOO B. LEE  
PATRICK D. LEIDIG  
ANTOINETTE S. LENTON  
JEFFREY L. K. LEW  
ZHAO LI  
TONY J. LOCROTONDO  
MATTHEW J. LOEWEN  
MEGAN R. LOFTSGAARDEN  
JAMIE L. LOMBARDO  
ARKADY LORIN  
RONALD J. LOVICH  
NATHAN L. LOW  
KEVIN LU  
TREVOR J. LUTZ  
KELLY E. MACDONALD

JOSEPH M. MACIUBA  
MATTHEW P. MANGINI  
ALBERT L. MARLE  
CAMERON R. MATTINGLY  
CLARA E. MCCOMB  
SEAN K. MCCOY  
RYAN A. MCDERMOTT  
JACOB D. MCFADDEN  
ANDREW H. MCGRAIN  
BLAINE D. MCGRAW  
ROBERT D. MCLEROY  
ROBERT M. MCREYNOLDS  
SHANE P. MCTIGHE  
SARAH A. MEDECK  
ADITYA MEHTA  
TRAVIS A. MELTON  
JAMIE L. MEREDITH  
BRIAN P. MILAM  
DALLIN F. MITCHELL  
ADAM R. MOECK  
TALITHA C. MOON  
ROBERT D. MOORE  
COLLEEN M. MORELAND  
JOHN W. MYERS III  
NEAL A. J. NETTESHEIM  
THOMAS M. NEUBAUER  
SAN FRANCISCO K. NGUYEN  
KYLE E. NIELSEN  
JUDY APRIL N. OPARAJI  
LAURA R. D. ORLANDO  
KATRINA M. OSTERMANN  
ARCHIE L. OVERMANN  
MISHA R. OWNBREY  
MEGAN E. PAGAN  
MATTHEW J. PARRY  
LUCY C. PATERSON  
JOSHUA Y. PAUL  
CASEY L. PAYNE  
SEAN G. PENBERTHY  
RYAN K. PHILLIPS  
LYDIA C. PIPER  
SUSIE PLATT  
AARON L. POCH  
KARA N. PURDY  
ROBERT W. RAMPTON  
NICHOLAS A. RATHJEN  
STEPHEN P. RECUPERO  
MALLORY E. REEVES  
MATTHEW C. RICHTER  
VANESSA M. RIVERA  
KYLE M. ROBINS  
MARIA I. RODIONOVA  
AMBER N. RODRIGUEZ  
MARY E. ROELOFS  
EMILY J. ROGERS  
GABRIELLE ROLLAND  
RACHEL M. ROSE  
ALEXANDRA P. ROSENBERG  
ILYA V. RYABOV  
SANDEEP SARAN  
SIMON A. SARKISIAN  
ADAM R. SCHNEIDER  
PHILLIP R. SCHNEIDER  
JAMES C. SCHOLFIELD  
MATTHEW J. SCHORR III  
JENNIFER L. SCHWANTES  
ANNA C. M. SEALANDER  
JOHN E. SEALANDER  
DANIEL J. SELIG  
JUSTIN O. SEVY  
NICOLE M. SGROMOLO  
ELENA W. Z. SHAHBAZI  
SIYAVASH D. SHAHBODAGHI  
EMILY D. SHEIKH  
ROWAN R. A. SHELDON  
JOSEPH D. SHEVCHIK  
EUGEN A. SHIPPEY III  
SETH C. SHORT  
JOSHUA T. SIGLER  
MEAGAN M. SIMPSON  
GRANT C. SIZEMORE  
ZACHARY P. SKURSKI  
ANTHONY R. SLADE  
SEAN E. SLAVEN  
ZACHARY J. SLETTEN  
FRANCIS M. SPAULDING  
JONATHAN RICHANDRA  
LAUREN E. STAIGER  
CHRISTOPHER M. STARK  
BRYAN A. STEPANENKO  
MEGAN P. STERLING  
SHANE P. SWEENEY  
KARL R. SWINSON  
SABRINA R. SZABO  
SETH I. TAFT  
LLOYD I. TANNENBAUM  
DAVID H. TASSIN  
STEPHANIE A. TASSIN  
KELLI B. A. TAVARES  
CHRISTOPHER C. TAYLOR  
JUAN F. TELLEZ  
CHRISTOPHER M. THURMOND  
RAMIN K. TOOFAN  
JOSE G. TORRIJOS  
ALEJANDRO S. TOSCANO  
THOMAS G. TOWNES  
SEAN P. TURNER  
RICHARD J. VANTIENDEREN  
JARED W. VEDROS  
SALVATORE L. VERSAGGI  
KEITH D. VOLNER  
RYAN M. VONDERHORST  
MORGAN E. WASICKANIN  
TRAVIS D. WEBER  
ALLISON M. WEBB  
ZACHARY J. WEBER  
JENNIFER A. WEEKS

JUSTIN M. WEI  
CHRISTOPHER M. WEIRTZ  
JESSICA B. WEISS  
REBECCA A. WETZEL  
STEVEN R. WILDING  
BRYAN R. WILLIAMS  
CHRISTOPHER W. WILSON  
JENNIFER L. WINDSOR  
DANIEL E. WINGARD  
DANIEL L. WINGO  
KATHERINE A. WINGO  
STEPHEN C. WONG  
VICTOR J. WONGK  
CHARL H. WOO  
LINDSAY K. E. WORKS  
MEGHAN U. YAMASAKI  
CHARLES Q. YANG  
ELIZABETH D. YU  
HENRY H. YU  
DAVID B. ZUSIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

#### *To be major*

DANTE L. AMELOTTI  
PATRICK J. ARBUCKLE  
DANIEL B. BRUIN  
MEGAN E. BUNTING  
YUSHENG CHEN  
JOHN R. COMBS II  
ALLEN J. DAVIS  
SEAN A. DEKOW  
DANIEL A. DIPIRRO, JR.  
MADELAINE J. DRISKILL  
JACQUES M. DUPRE  
EDWARD E. EVANS, JR.  
JANE B. FORD  
RYAN M. GEORGE  
TROY A. GESSNER  
KEVIN R. GOLES  
MARY J. HAMILTON  
GEORGE M. HANKEWYCZ  
CHELSEA E. HARRIS  
WILLIAM C. HAWKS  
RICHARD B. HILL  
JOAN J. Y. HONG  
YUNSUNG HONG  
ERIC C. HU  
ANDREW M. JANIGA  
SHAUNA D. JONES  
MATTHEW J. KECKEISEN  
HAN S. KIM  
ALIE C. KRAFT  
DAVID LAM  
RICHARD W. LAUDERBACK  
RICHARD M. LOW  
MARIAM R. MAIZI  
MATTHEW A. A. MASSEY  
KATHERINE L. MCCABE  
KELLY E. MCELROY  
CHRISTOPHER K. MERKLEY  
ADAM E. NAYLOR  
KELLIE S. OKEEFE  
STEPHANIE M. OPPENHEIM  
RYAN S. PAYNE  
JOELLE L. PROSE  
MILES L. RENICK  
JOSEPH K. RETRUM  
TERESA K. SAKAI  
JOSHUA S. SCHAEPE  
DAVID K. SCOVILLE  
KATIE M. SENKIW  
RORY D. SHARP  
JARED C. STEWART  
BRADLEY P. STORRS  
CALEB E. STOTT  
DANE T. SWENSON  
RENEE K. Y. TAI  
PETER M. TAN  
TAYLOR A. G. TOKUNAGA  
KATHERINE R. VAUGHAN  
DEVIN M. WAHLSTROM  
PATRICIA M. WALWORTH  
JOHN C. WARREN  
CAROLINA V. WENTWORTH  
MELANIE A. WHALEN  
JOSHUA C. WILLENS  
JOSHUA D. WILLIAMS  
HAROLD D. WILLIS, JR.  
RIKKI M. WINSLOW  
CHARLES W. WOODRUFF  
CHASE M. WOOTTON  
LARRY L. ZHANG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be colonel*

MARK E. PATTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be colonel*

CHRIS B. WINTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be lieutenant colonel*

GREGORIO AYALA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

VICTOR E. BEITELMAN  
ALEX G. GAUD  
CHARLES F. GWYNN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

BRENNAN A. BYLSMA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

DERRICK A. DEJON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

BRADLEY C. HANNON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

CHRISTEN L. HOLCOMBE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

IRWIN JOHNSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

BRIAN J. MAWYER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

SHAWN M. PIERCE

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be captain*

ROBERT K. DEBUSE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be commander*

JUSTIN W. JENNINGS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be captain*

MEHDI A. AKACEM  
AARON M. ANDERSON  
JOHN K. ANDERSON  
ZACHARIAH D. APERAUCH  
JOSHUA A. APPEZZATO  
JOSE A. ARANA  
GREGORY S. ARNOLD  
PAUL V. BANDINI  
DAVID H. BANKART  
JEFFERY W. BENSON  
EDWARD P. BERTUCCI  
RYAN B. BILLINGTON  
SILAS L. BOUYER II  
JEFFREY M. BOWMAN  
JACOB F. BRAUN  
ERIC H. BROMLEY  
CHRISTOPHER M. BROWN  
CHRISTOPHER K. BRUSCA  
ANDREW D. BUCHER  
PATRICK BURRUS  
ANDREW M. CAIN  
SCOTT I. CAMPBELL  
TIMOTHY R. CARTER  
PHILIP P. CASTELLANO  
RAPHAEL R. CASTILLEJO  
DAN S. CATLIN  
ORVILLE W. CAVE  
KEVIN A. CHAN  
ALLISON N. CHRISTY  
THOMAS E. CLARITY  
JEREMY A. CLARK  
BRADLEY D. CONVERSE  
ANDREW N. COOK  
PATRICK S. CORRIGAN  
JONATHAN A. CRAWFORD  
CURTIS W. CRUTHIRDS  
JANET H. DAYS  
DANIEL P. M. DELACRUZ  
JEFFREY M. DEMARCO  
AARON P. DEMEYER  
GRETA S. DENSHAM

CHRISTOPHER S. DENTZER  
 RYAN P. DEXTER  
 NATHAN P. DIAZ  
 STANLEY G. C. DICKERSON  
 CORBETT L. DIXON  
 CHRISTOPHER J. DOMENCIC  
 CHAD R. DONNELLY  
 ROSS A. DRENNING  
 SAMANTHA A. DUTILY  
 DERRICK W. EASTMAN  
 JOSHUA D. FAGAN  
 JOSEPH E. FALS  
 TIM L. FERRACCI  
 WILLIAM N. FILIP  
 DEREK R. FIX  
 THOMAS P. FLAHERTY III  
 MARIO T. FREEMAN  
 PETER D. FRENCH  
 KENNETH J. PROBERG  
 NATHAN W. FUGATE  
 RYAN T. FULWIDER  
 NATHAN J. GAMMACHE  
 DAVID A. GANCI  
 VICTOR J. GARZA  
 RYAN J. GAUL  
 BRADLEY D. GEARY  
 DONALD P. GERHARDSTEIN  
 CHRISTOPHER J. GIERHART  
 JOHN T. GONSER  
 BRIAN W. GRAVES  
 SAMUEL A. GRAY  
 JASON D. GRIZZLE  
 MICHAEL C. GRUBB  
 JAMES A. GUIMOND  
 BRYAN P. HAGER  
 BRIAN K. HAMEL  
 ALEX L. HAMPTON  
 CHAD A. HARDT  
 BARNET L. HARRIS II  
 KELLY K. HARRISON  
 RYAN C. HAYES  
 JOSEPH K. HAYWOOD  
 ROBERT B. HEATER  
 JASON B. HIGGINS  
 JESSE G. HILL  
 STEPHEN C. HINES  
 JAMES B. HOWELL  
 DAVID A. HULJACK  
 MATTHEW G. HUMPHREY  
 JAMES R. IMLAH  
 FRANK T. INCARIGLIA  
 PATRICK J. INGMAN  
 ERIC C. ISAACSON  
 JEREMIAH D. JACKSON  
 RYAN S. JACKSON  
 DENNIS W. JENSEN  
 JIMMIE J. JENSEN III  
 ROBERT S. JONES  
 ADRIAN W. JOPE  
 TY C. JURICA  
 GABRIEL M. KELLY  
 KENNETH M. KERR  
 BRIAN C. KESSELRING  
 VINCENT S. KING  
 ZACHARY S. KING  
 JAMES M. KINTER  
 MATTHEW J. KISER  
 ODIN J. KLUG  
 PHILIP E. KNIGHT  
 GREGORY R. KOEPP II  
 NEIL A. KRUEGER  
 JASON LABOTT  
 NICOLAS B. LECLERC  
 MICHAEL D. LEE  
 MATTHEW P. LEHMANN  
 JOHN D. LEVOY  
 SEAN P. LEWIS  
 STEVEN L. LIBERTY  
 SHAUN T. LIEB  
 WAYNE LIEBOLD  
 AMY E. LINDAHL  
 JAMES P. LOMAX  
 JUSTIN A. LONG  
 GERALD P. LORIO  
 KEVIN T. LOUIS  
 THOMAS R. LOVETT  
 GREGORY A. MACHI  
 ROBERT J. MARSH  
 WILLIAM M. MATHIS, JR.  
 ALLEN L. MAXWELL, JR.  
 THOMAS A. MAYS  
 JUSTIN T. MCCAFFREE  
 MICHAEL L. MCGLYNN  
 MATTHEW A. MCNEALY  
 JAVIER MEDINAMONTALVO  
 HOWARD V. MEEHAN  
 BENJAMIN B. MILLER  
 COURTNEY M. MINETREE  
 JESSE M. MINK  
 ANDREW B. MIROFF  
 LEROY J. MITCHELL  
 LADISLAW R. MONTERO  
 RUSSELL L. MOORE III  
 MICHAEL D. MORENO  
 CHRISTOPHER L. MOYLAN  
 JAMES A. MURDOCK  
 TIMOTHY J. MYERS  
 DAVID G. NEALL  
 KEVIN B. OBRIEN  
 PAUL D. OBRIEN  
 PATRICK R. OLOUGHLIN  
 MANUEL J. PARDO  
 EDDIE J. PARK  
 JESSICA R. PARKER  
 DANIEL A. PATRICK  
 AARON C. PETERSON  
 JOHN T. PIANETTA

EDWARD J. PLEDGER  
 JAMES T. POKORSKY  
 JOSEPH A. POMMERER  
 JENNIFER M. PONTIUS  
 MATTHEW J. POWEL  
 CHRISTOPHER M. PURCELL  
 LAWRENCE M. REPASS  
 RONEL C. REYES  
 JOHN P. RILEY  
 ERROL A. ROBINSON  
 MARK T. ROBINSON  
 JOSE A. ROMAN  
 KENNETH M. ROMAN  
 JACOB J. ROSALES  
 AARON P. RYBAR  
 BRIAN D. SANDERSON  
 STIG SANNESS  
 IAN J. SCALIATINE  
 JON P. SCHAFFNER  
 NATHAN W. SCHERRY  
 JOHN A. SCHIAFFINO  
 MATTHEW T. SCHLARMANN  
 RUDY SCHOEN  
 KEITH SCHROEDER  
 CHRISTOPHER J. SCHWARZ  
 MARVIN J. SCOTT  
 JEREMY A. SHAMBLEE  
 JONATHAN C. SHEPARD  
 ANDREW J. SHULMAN  
 MATTHEW A. SMIDT  
 BARRETT J. SMITH  
 GERALD N. SMITH  
 KENT D. SMITH  
 BRENT C. SPILLNER  
 ZACHARY S. STANG  
 AXEL L. STEINER  
 BRENDAN R. STICKLES  
 RYAN M. STODDARD  
 JOHN J. STRUNK  
 JEAN M. SULLIVAN  
 SCOTT A. SWAGLER  
 STEVEN TARR III  
 ERIK M. THOMAS  
 ERIC C. THOMPSON  
 JOHN V. TOBIN  
 MICHAEL C. TOMON  
 GEOFFREY W. TOWNSEND  
 ROBERT C. TRYON  
 JOHN D. TUTWILER  
 JOEL S. UZARSKI  
 MATTHEW T. VENTIMIGLIA  
 JAKE T. WADSLEY  
 ANTHONY L. WEBBER  
 STEPHEN R. WEEKS  
 MATTHEW S. WELLMAN  
 CARL J. WELLS  
 ROBERT J. WHEAT  
 DOUGLAS M. WHITE  
 LYNDEN D. WHITMER, JR.  
 WILLIAM H. WILEY  
 ROBERT A. WILKERSON  
 JAMES M. WILLIAMS  
 DAVID J. WILSON, JR.  
 JOHN F. WILSON  
 BRITTON D. WINDELER  
 JOHN C. WITTE  
 MATTHEW J. WOLFE  
 JARED W. WYRICK  
 TYSON M. YOUNG  
 CHIMI I. ZACOT  
 MARK E. ZEMATIS  
 JAMES G. ZOULIAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

GREGORY K. ALBAUGH  
 TIMOTHY A. BELCHER  
 WIRT W. CROSS, JR.  
 ERIC A. PARABAUGH  
 NORMAN A. HETZLER, JR.  
 JASON M. JOHNSON  
 VINCENT D. KOENIGSKNECHT  
 STEPHEN J. MILBACK  
 LUKE J. MORLEY  
 MARISELA M. NOORHASAN  
 ERIC C. PARLETTE  
 SUNEIL R. RAMCHANDANI  
 CARL A. RIDDICK  
 JOSEPH M. SEWARDS  
 DANIEL N. SEWTLICK  
 CHUN K. TSE  
 TEDMAN L. VANCE  
 EDWARD A. WALTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

MELANIE EVANGELISTA  
 ARTHUR D. GAGE  
 JOHN T. MARTIN  
 VICTOR R. ORAMAS  
 SCOTT T. OZAKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

CHARLOTTE E. CLUVERIUS  
 SEAN W. COGLEY  
 SUSAN L. DONOVAN  
 JON M. JEFFREYS  
 ERIC M. PEDERSEN

KAREN RICHMAN  
 CHRISTOPHER R. VINEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

JOE K. BLAIR II  
 JOSEPH T. DELINO  
 TABITHA R. EDEN  
 LORI A. HEINER  
 AMY E. LAMANCUSA  
 BAMBI L. PISHDERR  
 PATRICIA M. ROTH  
 BRENDA K. SHEPHERD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*

GUSTAVO AGUILAR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*

RICHARD L. EGGERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be captain*

RICHARD H. SCHRECKENGAUST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

MICHAEL V. GOMES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

DAVID A. SCHWIND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

JOHN FRANCO  
 PATRICE M. HIGGINS  
 ANDREW P. MUELLER  
 MICHAEL A. PETTOLA  
 CHRISTOPHER T. SAWYER  
 FRANK R. SOLORZANO, JR.  
 JOSEPH W. STUBITZ  
 JAMES O. TOAL  
 CLINTON D. TRACY  
 MARK A. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

JOHN A. EVANS  
 CHRISTOPHER S. KOPRIVEC

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

PATRICK A. BELLAR  
 SCOTT E. CARLSON  
 MARK G. DIETER  
 MICHAEL P. MORENO  
 PRATIK RAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

PERRY R. BARKER  
 SCOTT M. KELLEY  
 JARROD A. MOHR  
 DAVID C. ROBINSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be captain*

PAUL S. RUBEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

AMADA Y. AVALOS  
 GLENN G. BUNI  
 BILLY F. HALL, JR.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR SPACE  
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

*To be colonel*

MICHAEL S. HOPKINS

IN THE COAST GUARD  
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST

GUARD AS A MEMBER OF THE COAST GUARD PERMA-  
NENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF UNDER TITLE 14,  
U.S.C., SECTION 1943:

*To be lieutenant commander*  
NICHOLAS C. CUSTER  
NICOLE L. BLANCHARD